P. PAPINIUS STATIUS

SILVAE BOOK II

A Commentary

MNEMOSYNE

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA BATAVA

COLLEGERUNT

A. D. LEEMAN · H. W. PLEKET · C. J. RUIJGH

BIBLIOTHECAE FASCICULOS EDENDOS CURAVIT

C. J. RUIJGH, KLASSIEK SEMINARIUM, OUDE TURFMARKT 129, AMSTERDAM

SUPPLEMENTUM OCTOGESIMUM SECUNDUM

HARM-JAN VAN DAM

P. PAPINIUS STATIUS
SILVAE BOOK II
A Commentary

LUGDUNI BATAVORUM E. J. BRILL MCMLXXXIV

P. PAPINIUS STATIUS

SILVAE BOOK II

A Commentary

BY

HARM-JAN VAN DAM

LEIDEN E. J. BRILL 1984

The publication of this book was made possible through a grant from the Netherlands Organization for the Advancement of Pure Research (Z.W.O.).

ISBN 90 04 07110 5

Copyright 1984 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or translated in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, microfiche or any other means without written permission from the publisher

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS BY E. J. BRILL

AMICIS FIDELIBUS

CONTENTS

Preface IX

Abbreviations X

Introduction 1

P. Papini Stati *Silvarum* Liber Secundus

Conspectus siglorum 25
List of deviations from Marastoni's edition 25
Text 27

Commentary

Praefatio 51
II 1. Glaucias Atedii Melioris delicatus 63
II 2. Villa Surrentina Pollii Felicis 187
II 3. Arbor Atedii Melioris 281
II 4. Psittacus Atedii Melioris 336
II 5. Leo mansuetus 368
II 6. Consolatio ad Flavium Ursum de amissione pueri delicati .. 390
II 7. Genethliacon Lucani ad Pollam 450

Appendix: Speeches in the *Silvae* 507

Bibliography 509

Index 529

PREFACE

On completing this book I realise, not for the first time, that although Statius and his *Silvae* have claimed my attention for a considerable time, they have done so with varying degrees of importunity. Work on the dissertation started in November 1975 and proceeded on a full-time basis for three years. From 1979 onwards progress was more erratic. The manuscript was finalized in February 1983. Consequently, literature published after that date could not be incorporated; I am referring in particular to Alex Hardie's *Statius and the Silvae. Poets, Patrons and Epideixis in the Graeco-Roman World* (Liverpool 1983) and J. Klecka's new, computerized concordance of Statius (Hildesheim/New York/Zürich 1983). All my references to a concordance are to the work of Deferrari and Eagan.

It is impossible to mention the names of all those who have, in the course of time, assisted me, but some exceptions must be made. Dr. Malcolm Belfield of Bristol was unsparing in his efforts to make my English intelligible to others than the author himself. Where he has not succeeded, I alone am to blame. Mrs. A. M. van der Wiel-van der Lee fought a valiant battle with my handwriting and inconsistent instructions, emerging victoriously with the typescript. Ton Stauttener critically and competently typed the bibliography. Kees van Leijenhorst consulted material from the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* on some points. Marlein van Raalte, with the thoroughness for which she is known, hunted out deficiencies in my system of bibliographical and other references. Louis Looren de Jong and Lucette Oostenbroek went through the laborious process of proof-reading, cheerfully drawing attention to errors of other kinds during the course of their work. For all the remaining shortcomings of this book, I accept full responsibility.

Although I am grateful to my parents who have generously supported me throughout in every possible way, this book is dedicated to my friends over the years. Now while, to paraphrase a French cartoonist, this costs nothing and pleases almost everyone, I know of no other way to make it clear to them that, without their unwavering faith in my ability to complete this book and without the numerous other tokens of their affection, I would have given the struggle up long ago. Finally, for reasons which should be obvious to him, this book is especially for Louis.

Leiden, June 1984

ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations for Latin authors and texts follow the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* or, for later authors only, the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*. Statius, however, has been abbreviated as St. (and Statius' as Sts.') and *Thebais* as *Th.* References without a title, given as 'II 1' or 'III 5, 13' are to the *Silvae*.

In the commentary the following abbreviations are used, either to designate the author or the book mentioned[1]:

Baehr.	E. Baehrens, *Statius. Silvae.* Leipzig 1876.
E.-F.	J. Esteve Forriol, *Die Trauer- und Trostgedichte in der römischen Literatur.* München 1962.
Forc.	A. Forcellini a.o., *Lexicon totius latinitatis.* Pavia 1864-1926^{4} (1965). 4 voll.
Fr.	H. Frère, *Silves.* Paris 1944 (Budé).
Håk.	L. Håkanson, *Statius' Silvae.* Lund 1969.
Kl.	A. Klotz, *Silvae.* Leipzig 1911^{2}.
K.-St.	R. Kühner, C. Stegmann, A. Thierfelder, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache.* Leverkusen 1955^{3} (2 voll.)
LHSz.	M. Leumann, J. B. Hofmann, A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Grammatik. Teil II Syntax und Stilistik.* München 1965 (1972).
LHSz. I	M. Leumann, *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre.* München 1977^{2}.
Mar.	A. Marastoni, *Silvae.* Leipzig 1970^{2}.
Markl.	J. Markland, *Silvae.* Dresden 1827^{2}.
Mozl.	J. H. Mozley, *Statius. Opera.* London/New York 1928 (Loeb).
Neue-W.	F. Neue & C. Wagener, *Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache.* Leipzig 1892-1905^{3}.
Nisbet-H.	R. G. M. Nisbet & M. Hubbard, *Horace Odes I, II.* Oxford 1970, 1978.
OLD	Ed. P. G. W. Glare, *The Oxford Latin Dictionary.* Oxford 1968-1982.
Onom.	A. Forcellini a.o., *Lexicon totius latinitatis* Voll. V and VI *Onomasticon,* auct. I. Perin. Pavia 1864-1926^{4}.
Phill.	J. Phillimore, *Silvae.* Oxford 1917^{2}.
PIR	E. Groag & A. Stein, *Prosopographia Imperii Romani Saec. I, II, III.* Berlin 1933^{2}.
Postg.	J. P. Postgate, *Silvae.* London 1904.
RE	Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll a.o., *Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft.* Stuttgart 1894 ff.
RLAC	Th. Klauser a.o., *Reallexicon für Antike und Christentum.* Stuttgart 1950-
Saeng.	G. Saenger, *Silvae.* St. Petersburg 1909.
Sb.	F. Sbordone, *Le Selve.* Napoli 1970.
SG	L. Friedländer & G. Wissowa, *Sittengeschichte Roms.* Leipzig 1919-23^{10}.
TLL	*Thesaurus Linguae Latinae.*
Traglia-Ar.	A. Traglia & G. Aricò, *Opere di Publio Papinio Stazio.* Torino 1980.
Vollm.	F. Vollmer, *Silvae.* Leipzig 1898.

---

1 For full titles, see Bibliography.

INTRODUCTION

§ 1. *Life of Statius*[1]

All data on Sts.' life must be gathered from his poems, mainly from the *Silvae*, with the exception of one tiny detail in Juvenal, the only contemporary author to mention St. (7, 82 ff. See n. 23 and n. 31 below). The information which later Latin writers offer is made up from their own inferences from Sts.' poetry (Iul. Capitol., Sid., Serv.)[2].

P. Papinius Statius was born, probably around 50 A.D.[3], in Naples, a thoroughly Hellenized city[4]. His father had a flourishing school in this city and pupils from the whole of Southern Italy were sent there to be instructed in Greek and Latin literature[5]. The elder Papinius was a poet in his own right, who as a young boy had won recognition in the *Augustalia* in Naples and had later won prizes in the great Greek *agones*[6]. St. mentions no other teacher of himself than his father[7].

Before 69 the family moved to Rome, where Papinius senior opened a new school, with the emphasis rather more on educating young Romans who were destined for a public career[8]. Meanwhile his interest in composing poetry remained alive: shortly after the *Bellum Vitellianum* of December 69, when the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus burnt down, he celebrated the event in a poem[9]. Ten years later the eruption of Vesuvius inspired him to another composition, but he died before he had begun to realise this plan, at the age of 65[10].

In the meantime young Statius had achieved his first successes with his poetry before Roman senators[11]. Like his father, he reported his first great literary victory in the Neapolitan *Augustalia*, at the latest in 78[12]. Before his father's death he embarked upon his Thebaid[13]. In the same period he married Claudia, who was probably from Rome, the widow of a singer or cithern-player. She brought a daughter with her. No children were born from this marriage[14].

One of the most important moments in Sts.' career must have been his victory in the Alban Games, the *Quinquatrua Minervae*, which Domitian had established. This took place in 90[15]. But this first official token of imperial approval was followed by a disappointment: in the Capitoline Games of the same year St. was, apparently contrary to his expectations, not crowned as the victor[16].

In 94 we hear St. complain of having been seriously ill. In a poem he talks of going back to Naples[17]. Whether he really intended to return to Naples or not, it seems probable that he continued to live in Rome[18]. No

poetry by St. or information about him which can be dated after 96 exists. The unfinished state of the Achilleid, work on which had begun in 95, suggests that he died not long after 96[19].

§ 2. *Environment*

It should be taken into account that St. spent his first years in Naples, that epitome of leisure, learning and culture, in short, a Greek city on Roman soil. The bay of Naples would always remain his real home and Greek and Roman culture would be one and the same thing to him[20].

In Rome he earned his living as a poet. This means that in return for his poetry he received invitations, presents and money. But St. did not consider himself a mere *cliens*, nor, so it seems, did his rich patrons treat him in this way. St. never employs the word *patronus*, for to him his rich protectors are *amici*: the old interpretation of one kind of *amicitia* as the devoted attachment of a poorer man to a rich one also applied to the poet and his Maecenas. *Amicitia* in this sense is a career or a vocation. St., like other first-century poets, presented the rich with his poetry, dignifying their *otium* in this way. In return he received some support and protection.[21]

Sts.' position has been compared to that of Horace, not without reason[22]. Differences are that St. is dependent upon a fairly large number of rich and cultured Romans (he mentions nearly 20 of them in his prefaces) and that the way of life of these gentlemen is different from that of their Augustan equivalents: retirement from politics had become wide-spread in a society where virtually all real power lay with the Emperor. The flowering of literary coteries, cultivated dinner-parties and recitations of poetry was a part of this development. The dissemination of these interests was wide and the persons whom St. mentions did not form a close group; the only things which they had in common were high birth, money and a lack of political power[23].

In modern times St. (like Martial) has often been severely criticized for his flattery of his 'friends' and more particularly of the highest literary patron of them all, the Emperor Domitian[24]. Though St. indeed attributes qualities and talents to his friends too outstanding to be true, it must be kept in mind that this was essential to the kind of poetry which he wrote and was forced to write[25]. As regards the emperor, it must not be forgotten that since the time of Augustus the poets had identified the living emperor with a god. Though veneration of the emperor in his lifetime did not become part of the official state cult until Diocletian, all kinds of private persons, corporations and larger bodies considered the emperor as divine: he is a star, his palace is the sky, his size and weight,

like those of the gods, are superhuman. Domitian was especially interested in styling himself, almost officially, *dominus et deus*. Apart from that, there is no reason to doubt Domitian's interest in literature and art, or for completely sharing the ancient historians' judgment on Domitian as a ruler[26].

§ 3. *The Silvae. General*

Shortly after his work on the Thebaid was finished, in 91 or 92, St. began to collect his shorter poems and published the first book of the *Silvae*[27]. Three other books followed within a relatively short period: the second book in 92/3, the third book after the summer of 93, the fourth book in the summer of 95[28]. None of the datable poems which these books contain was written before 89. The fifth book was edited posthumously[29]. Most poems in it which can be dated are from 95, but the poem on his father's death, V 3, had been written by St. around 80 and revised after 90[30]. This goes some way to show what is probable anyhow, that St. wrote poems similar to those in the *Silvae* before 89. It would be surprising too if the *Silvae* as we know them contained all the poems which St. had composed in the period between 89 and 95[31]. In the second book there are only two poems which can be dated with any probability: II 1 must have been written around 90 and II 2 shortly before the 13th of August of the year 90[32].

The order of the poems, both in relation to poems in other books of the *Silvae* and to those in the same book is not fortuitous. A deliberate structure in this respect was to be expected from a poet with Hellenistic and Augustan examples in the way of books of non-epic verse before him[33]. Chronology plays hardly a part as a structuring device, but metre, length and subject do[34].

To start with metre, II 7, the last poem of the book, is the only one in it not to have been written in stichic hexameters, but in hendecasyllables, which assume a closure-function elsewhere in the *Silvae* too[35].

II 3, II 4 and II 5 clearly belong together: St. himself combines these three poems in II *Praef.* 16-9 and taken together they are about as long as the average of the other four poems[36]. Moreover, they all have a similar theme, the contrast between Nature and Culture: the tree representing a living being in its stylized park (II 3), the bird in its 'palace', which talks like a human being (II 4), the lion trained by man to do its tricks and to die like a soldier (II 5)[37]. When it is recognized that II 1 and II 6 are both poems on the death of a favourite slave (though different in many respects[38]), it is seen that they frame not only II 3, 4, 5, but also II 2, which has a subject similar to that of these poems, Man taming Nature.

Thus II 1, 6 and 7 (which also celebrates someone who has died) in a sense belong together, II 7 rounding off the book in a more optimistic vein[39]. II 2, 3, 4, 5 form the second group. These middle poems are somewhat longer, taken together, than those framing them.

Other structural devices are used in addition to these principles: II 1, II 3 and II 4 share the same dedicatee. II 4 and II 5 belong together as poems on the death of an animal. All poems, except for II 2 and II 3 (these two poems constitute about one third of the book) belong in a way to the same *genre*, the *consolatio*[40].

The name which St. selected for his collected shorter poems was *Silvae*[41]. By giving the whole this title, he implied that the books contained a miscellany of poems with various form and content. It is less probable that contemporaries concluded from the title that they contained occasional verse, or that the poems were unpolished, improvised or both[42]. But, though the title *Silvae* does not imply this, St. himself constantly draws his readers' attention to these three characteristics of his poems: they have been composed at great speed, that is, they are improvisations, and for that reason they have been less carefully polished than his friends and patrons merit[43]. But then, being occasional verse, they are mere trifles, *prolusiones*, compared to real, that is epic (or dramatic) poetry[44]. None of these reservations is completely true, nor does St. intend his audience to take them at face value.

As far as improvisation is concerned, St. implies that not all his poems were written at short notice[45]. More importantly, critics have sometimes been too willing to believe Sts.' protestations[46] and loosely refer to set phrases and repetitions, whereas they have not enough noticed how carefully constructed the poems are[47]. On the other hand, when St. mentions that poems have been composed within a few hours, he must be speaking the truth, since the addressees could easily have given him the lie. The solution to this dilemma is to be found in the way of publication of the *Silvae*: we must imagine St. invited to a dinner-party, or sometimes for a stay of a few days in a villa on the coast, knowing that some poetry was expected in return. This poetry he produced, in a very short time if necessary, drawing on vast experience and great talent. Later he polished the poem and he may have sent it to the addressee or to a small circle of friends as a *de luxe* edition; this he may also have done with poems which were not read on the spot, but composed at home and probably read in recitations[48]. Finally he collected poems, the best and/or those offering him most advantage from his friends, and published them together, perhaps after another revision[49]. When St. harps on the quickness of his composition, he is, in fact, boasting of his fluency and when he excuses his slovenly work, he is, of course, quasi-

modest. When he calls his poems 'trifles', he is serious up to a point, for epic poetry ranges above this kind of verse, but he does not in earnest disparage his own work[50].

§ 4. *The Silvae as poetry*

Many poems in the *Silvae* can be considered as belonging to a poetical *genre*, if *genre* is defined in terms of content: poems in one and the same *genre* share a primary situation which produces a set of necessary elements, common and exclusive to the poems belonging to the *genre*. Secondary elements, *topoi*, often in a constant order or place in the context, accompany these first elements[51]. In the *Silvae* we have, for instance, the *epithalamium* (I 2), the *consolatio* (II 1, 6, III 3, V 1, 3, 5, see II 4 (*Intr.*), II 5 (*Intr.*)), the *genethliacon* (II 7, see II 3 (*Intr.*), IV 7, 8), the *propempticon* (III 2, 4), perhaps the *soteria* (I 4), the *eucharisticon* (IV 2)[52].

A few reservations must be made: some matters of form, like length and metre, are closely connected with content. Since Lucan's *Silvae* are lost (and who knows how much similar poetry with it), certainty is impossible, but it seems that St. is innovating in this field: he treats serious subjects in a traditionally frivolous metre, the hendecasyllable[53], and by far the greatest number of his poems is written in stichic hexameters, whereas the elegiac distich is the usual metre for most earlier poems in the above-mentioned *genres*, though not exclusively so[54]. Moreover, his poems are often much longer than similar earlier ones.

Secondly, each new poem contributes to the *genre* by trying to be original, that is to say the 'set of rules' and especially that of *topoi* of the various *genres* is not fixed, but constantly, if slightly, changing. Sts.' contribution in this development is no small one: not only in that he has original points in all his poems belonging to a *genre*, even in his *consolationes*, one of the most fixed *genres*; for some 'sets of rules' or *topoi* he is one of the most prominent informants[55]. Moreover, St. sometimes combines several *genres*, or at least has many elements of the one *genre* in a poem of an other *genre*, for instance in II 3 the *genethliacon* and the *aition*, with *topoi* of the love elegy, in II 7 the *consolatio* and the *genethliacon*, in II 4 the epigram on a dead animal and the *consolatio*[56].

A third point which must be brought up here is that of rhetorical theory: in the past it has often been concluded that Sts.' poems were composed according to the rules of rhetoric[57]. In recent decades, however, it has become more and more clear that generic rules (and this is also true for other phenomena in poetry which have a counterpart in rhetoric, like descriptions or 'rhetorical formulas') are essentially a part of poetry. The rules for poetical pieces with a certain content or in a cer-

tain context are transmitted in the poetry itself[58]. Only relatively slowly, in later antiquity, were these rules systematized, codified and used for prescribing certain ways of composing, and then in the first instance only for oratorical pieces, not for poetry. It is significant that poems belonging to a *genre* tend to become more elaborate and more original up to a certain point in time (after Statius) and only begin to adhere more rigidly to certain rules concerning order and content of *topoi* after the full development of rhetorical prescriptions, generally in the 3rd/4th century A.D.[59]. Rhetorical rules were, of course, known to Statius, for this statement amounts to saying that he had been at school, but extrapolating these rules from rhetorical theory of the 3rd century and applying them to the writing of Flavian poetry is both unsound on principle and generally doomed to fail in practice. All poetry is rhetorical in the sense that poets consciously employ traditional forms, schemes, *topoi* and phrases, adapting those to the effects they want to create in their audience, but not in the sense that poets compose according to textbooks with rules where the structure of each kind of poem is prescribed[60].

Two essential characteristics of the *Silvae* which rise above generic considerations, but are frequently treated also in connection with rhetoric are description and encomium. Some poems in the *Silvae* have a description as their main subject, but up to a certain extent description manifests itself in all the poems[61]. These descriptions have been connected with the formal ἔκφρασις, a form of the so-called *progymnasmata*, a kind of exercise in model-drawing with words for secondary school pupils. But descriptions are a constant feature of all ancient poetry from Homer onwards and St. is just one of the first poets to make them such an important part of his poetry[62]. Moreover, description is never the sole purpose of Sts.' *Silvae*: it is generally one way to praise someone and serves within a greater frame of mythology and other almost symbolic references to forms of reality as a part of the structure of the whole poem[63]. In this context another characteristic of Sts.' poetry may be mentioned, the attention to detail and the power of observation shown in it: in describing scenes or situations St. generally picks out one or more tiny details to illustrate them rather than giving a general impression. In his mythological comparisons especially he tends to picture a concrete scene or detail instead of keeping strictly to the *tertium comparationis*. Elsewhere too he introduces a wealth of vividly painted details to illustrate a general statement. He manifests this visual attitude also in his preference for splendour and colour when describing. St. frequently mentions these concepts (and seeing in general) in a great variety of terms. The many descriptive adjectives in the *Silvae* also suggest this tendency of the poet[64].

Encomium was a necessity for a poet in Sts.' position and cultural environment. It is present in virtually all the poems and nearly always dispersed throughout them. The fact that St. frequently lavishes abundant praise has too often been used as the base for a negative aesthetic judgment of his poetry.

Under the influence of E. R. Curtius the notion of mannerism has become a key-concept in describing Sts.' poetry, or, indeed, most first-century poetry. For Curtius and most of his followers mannerism, originally a term for late 16th-century art, is the antipole or complement to 'the classical'[65]. Other critics use terms like 'baroque' or even 'surrealism' for describing post-Augustan literature[66]. In general two 'styles' are distinguished, the 'pathetic', 'excessive', 'horrible' and the 'precious', 'ingenious', 'pointed' one, with Seneca the tragedian, Lucan and Statius the epic poet as the main representatives of the first 'style' and (Statius as the poet of) the *Silvae* as more or less the sole representative of the other one[67].

However, this use of 'mannerism' to define some Latin poetry is dangerous. In the first place, transferring terms from the domain of visual art to literature involves serious theoretical problems, which are aggravated by the inconsistent or indiscriminate use of terms other than mannerism for the same phenomenon. Moreover, not much is won by incorporating all ancient literature into one of two groups. Secondly, as an instrument for stylistic research mannerism is much too blunt a tool. This is borne out by the fact that virtually all figures of speech and thought from anacoluthon to zeugma have at one time or other been called 'mannerist'. The picture is blurred even more because most critics are very vague as to what is 'an excessive use' of certain in themselves neutral devices by which the poem, the poet, or even the period becomes 'mannerist'[68]. Thirdly, on the one hand the influence of earlier 'classical' poetry on Flavian literature tends to be obscured by this dichotomy and on the other hand the *Silvae* tend to become still more isolated than they already are.

But in spite of all these objections it can not be denied that the term mannerism has had a certain utility as a heuristic instrument, in any case for criticism on the *Silvae*, as far as content is involved: many useful and perceptive observations have been made about Sts.' themes, *topoi* and general attitude, rightly or wrongly (the last, I think) brought together under the banner of mannerism.

The phenomena under consideration may be summarized under the heading 'half-way situations', or rather the German *Schwebesituationen*: a thing is something and not something at the same time. Or it is both things at once. Thus St. is fond of describing shadow on water: the thing

reflected is in the running water (in itself an unstable substance) and at the same time it is not, the more so since the reflection is disturbed by the water. Sts.' treatment of conditions hovering between light and shadow, death and life, boy and girl, slave and son, or of motifs like 'mirror', 'hair' is comparable[69]. In all Sts.' poems in the *Silvae* there is some leading paradox as the central idea, which is illuminated in many turns and phrases in the poem[70]. Sts.' handling of mythology can also be seen in this light: it points to something beyond itself, whether as a structural device of the poem or as an expression of real, objective life on an other plane. This inter-relationship of myth and life makes mythology in St. more than a mere machinery. In this connection it may be remarked that, though St. has often been reproved for his abstruse or obscure mythological allusions, his erudition is not inconsiderable, but neither is it out of the ordinary[71]. The juxtaposition of Nature and Culture can also be seen in the light of conflicting points of view in St., but not without a qualification: as regards poetical devices, St. constantly exploits this contrast in the *Silvae* and this results in paradox. But insofar as his own attitude as a poet is reflected, he believes in Culture and Progress, not in extolling Nature for its own sake, or in ancient Roman virtues. Few Roman authors have so little of the *laudator temporis acti* as St.[72].

As far as the style of the *Silvae* is concerned, in the commentary attention is given principally to Sts.' choice and use of words[73].

The first remarkable thing about Sts.' vocabulary is its richness: there is a wealth of synonyms and different phrases to describe similar concepts. St. rarely repeats himself literally[74]. In some cases when he uses the same word twice within a few lines, it must be interpreted in two different ways[75]. Only a few times St. repeats a word literally at short interval, sometimes exploiting the figure of anaphora. That the poems were originally composed at some speed may be a partial explanation, since repetition seems to be less prominent in the Thebaid than in the *Silvae*[76]. St. is often at pains to avoid using common and almost indispensable words like *esse* as long as possible. In omitting the copula his technique is Vergilian[77].

St. also coins new words or infuses existing words with a sense not found before him. In both respects he has been more active in the *Silvae* than in the epics. This is also true for words which are found in prose before St., but which he introduces into poetry[78]. Archaisms are rare and imitated from Augustan poetry rather than from old Latin poetry[79].

One of the forms in which the differences between epic poetry and light verse manifest themselves in Latin is the use or avoidance of certain words and expressions. A few times St. employs in the *Silvae* words and phrases which do not fit the epic tone and are therefore not frequent, or

completely avoided in his epics, e.g. *ire* for 'to die', adjectives or nouns ending in *-anus, noli* followed by the infinitive, *merx, strangulare, bilis, tamquam, volenti* for 'to someone's liking', *gladiator, diaeta* (outhouse), or *census* (money)[80]. In other cases, however, words or phrases which are apparently considered as 'vulgar' by other epic poets are used in Sts.' epics, whereas their more elevated synonyms occur in the *Silvae*: St. favours *lassus* over *fessus* much more often in his epics than in the *Silvae* and the same thing is true for *licet* and *quamvis* and *fortasse* and *forsan*. Other 'low' words occur in the Thebaid, but not in the *Silvae*, like *ob*, or more frequently in the Thebaid, like *facundus*[81]. But what is most often the case is that solecisms or personal preferences of St. are found in similar measure in his epics and in the *Silvae*: a prosaic expression like *quid (ni)si*, the strange use of *procul* with a comparative, the interchange in meaning between words for size and quantity, the preference for *tunc* over *tum* and for *quis* over *quibus*, the use of *quamquam*[82]. In a few instances the correspondence between epics and *Silvae* may be explained by imitation of the epic style, or even parody, but Sts.' boast that his father taught him *non vulgare loqui* applies apparently also to the *Silvae*[83].

Of some words which St. favours much more than other poets, it may be held that the laudatory intent of the poems influences their choice, like *blandus, hilaris, mitis*; other preferences are more difficult to account for, for instance *penes* or the clustering of etymologies[84].

The reason why Sts.' style has often been called difficult or mannered may be his habit of extending normal poetic usage by combining. Thus he rarely employs a comparison or simile without at the same time hyperbolically claiming superiority for one of the elements over the other[85]. St. compresses different thoughts into one sentence[86]. He combines adjectives which aim especially at painting a detail with unexpected nouns[87]. Innovations in the field of words followed by an infinitive, gerund or supine or an other complement are found[88]. St. employs the same word with different complements[89]. Because of their juxtaposition with other, common terms words must sometimes be explained in an unusual way[90]. St. combines a great number of words in *apo koinou*[91]. In short, he stretches the language as far as it will go.

As regards phrases, too much attention has been drawn to so-called rhetorical formulas and exclamations. They certainly occur (though not as frequently as some critics imply), but they often have a function in dividing the poem or focussing the attention. Moreover these formulas also occur, although probably less often, in Augustan poetry[92].

§ 5. *The tradition of the text*

The *Silvae* were much read and imitated in later antiquity, but in the Middle Ages they disappeared almost completely not to reappear before the 15th century[93]. In 1417 Poggio found in Sankt Gallen or Reichenau a manuscript containing Silius' *Punica*, Manilius' *Astronomica* and the five books of the *Silvae*. Since he was not given the original, he had it copied by a scribe, being profoundly dissatisfied with the result when it was finished. He sent the copy to his friend Francesco Barbaro in Venice, asking him to make copies of this apographon, to be forwarded to Niccolò Niccoli in Florence. Things came to a standstill for a time until the first printed edition of the *Silvae* appeared in 1472.

Within ten years more editions followed and in Florence Poliziano lectured on the *Silvae* and composed the first version of a commentary, in constant polemic with Domizio Calderini, one of the first editors of the *Silvae*. In the course of his work Poliziano acquired one of the copies which had been made of the apographon Poggio had sent to Venice and jotted down variant readings found there in the margin of his text, the *editio princeps*, along with his own emendations. This book has become known as the *exemplar Corsinianum*, because it is kept in the Biblioteca Corsiniana in Rome[94].

The apographon which had been made for Poggio was unearthed in 1879 in the National Library in Madrid by Gustav Loewe. In 1898 it was demonstrated that all other extant manuscripts of the *Silvae* descend from this manuscript, M. 3678 (formerly M. 31). The original manuscript which Poggio found in the vicinity of Konstanz is apparently for ever lost[95].

The manuscript tradition of the *Silvae* would be a very simple one if it were not for Poliziano. In the margins of the *exemplar Corsinianum* he states some facts about the manuscript which he possessed and its readings which forbid its identification with M and other facts which suggest this identification. The most important of those are 1) that he speaks of it as the *liber vetustissimus Poggii qui e Germania in Italiam est relatus*; 2) that in this *liber* line 86a of *Silv.* I 4 is missing, which is not the case in M or in any other extant ms.; 3) that his manuscript had a hole at V 5, 24-7; of such a hole, again, there is no trace in our manuscripts. These and connected minor problems have provoked an embittered battle between scholars which has not yet been decided and, so it seems, is impossible to decide without new material turning up[96].

The essential questions are 1) what kind of manuscript did Poliziano acquire? Did it *a)* represent the same tradition as M, or *b)* a different one? If *a)* the above-mentioned problems must be solved; if *b)* why does it

in all but a few instances conspire with M against the *editio princeps* and how could this tradition have so completely disappeared? 2) Is M really the apographon which was made for Poggio? It will be seen that 1) *b* is highly improbable if M is really identical with Poggio's copy, for Poliziano repeatedly connects his manuscript with Poggio.

A solution of these problems, which are much more complex than can be set out here, has become almost an act of faith. It seems more than probable that M is indeed identical with the copy made for Poggio in 1417[97]. Poliziano's manuscript could just represent a different tradition, but this seems hardly possible. If those two things are granted, this manuscript must have been an isolated copy of M (not necessarily an uncontaminated one), in view of problems 2) and 3). The first problem, how could Poliziano call a 15th-century manuscript *vetustus* and *vetustissimus*, may be solved by imputing stupidity or mendacity to Poliziano, suggestions indignantly rejected by many scholars, especially Italians. This, indeed, seems out of the question[98]. The alternative is more probable: it must be assumed that Poliziano referred not to the concrete manuscript under his eyes, but rather to the original manuscript in Switzerland, since he knew or estimated that his manuscript adhered closer to this original than the *editio princeps* did[99]. Even if an independent tradition were represented in the *exemplar Corsinianum*, which I think is not the case, this would influence the constitution of the text only in a small degree.

There is one extant manuscript which is much older than M, the 10th-century L, which contains the text of *Silvae* II 7, among several short technical and religious pieces. However, it represents the same tradition as M. It was already known to Poliziano, who collated it with his own manuscript[100].

M, its copies and the early editions contain errors by the score and conjectural criticism sprang up as soon as the *Silvae* became known, never since to abate, though based on more solid ground after the dependency of all manuscripts on M had been shown[101].

In the field of editions the most useful contributions are the work of Markland, both for explaining and emending the text, Vollmer for the wide scope of his commentary, Klotz for the introductions and the *apparatus* of his editions, and Frère's Budé edition for its compact notes. The recent edition by Traglia and Aricò offers much information and sense.

A history of the literary influence of the *Silvae*, especially in the 16th century and afterwards still needs to be written.

§ 6. *Aim and scope of the commentary*

The first aim of the notes is to throw light upon what St. says and how he says it. The *Silvae* have been a noted battlefield for textual criticism and this is not ignored in the commentary. I have attempted to include much earlier scholarship on *Silvae* II; this may account for a sometimes lengthy treatment of textual problems. The emphasis in the commentary is on interpretation, both of single words or phrases and of longer passages and the poems as a whole. This involves remarking on Sts.' idiom, but also on the way in which he handles his material. The outlook in the notes is predominantly literary: it has been tried to look for what is conventional and what is new in Sts.' use of ideas, themes and *topoi*. Questions of *imitatio, aemulatio* and *genre* are mainly treated in the introductions to the single poems, along with remarks on the structure and significance of the poem in question. Similarly, in dealing with Sts.' way of expressing himself correspondences and differences with his own epics as well as with other poetry are pointed out. This results in quoting a fairly large number of parallel passages. Though *realia* are not missing, the historical component in this book is generally confined to cultural history or the history of ideas. Biographical matters are treated in the short general introduction above; the main objects of this introduction are to outline several aspects of Statius and his *Silvae* and to gather dispersed material published after the appearance of Vollmer's commentary.

§ 7. *Note on the use of this commentary*

All important textual problems are treated in the commentary. Therefore the text which is printed here is without a critical apparatus: its sole purpose is to enable the reader to see at a glance the outcome of the discussion in the commentary. For convenience's sake too a list of deviations from Marastoni's Teubner text is given, because I assume that edition to be the one most widely used. This edition has also been employed for the sigla and the numbering of Sts.' *Praefationes*.

A number of works are quoted by abbreviation. A list of these precedes this *Introduction*. The secondary literature referred to in the commentary is quoted exclusively by name of author and, if necessary, date, with the (partial) exception of footnotes and the *Introductions* to the individual poems. All titles which are quoted only by name of author are elucidated in a *Bibliographical Key* at the end of the book, except for some editions of and commentaries on ancient texts. That such works are meant is always indicated in the commentary. Even so the *Bibliographical Key* has swollen beyond normal proportions, but it is hoped that this is

compensated for by the space won in the commentary. The commentary on each poem is preceded by an *Introduction*, where a selection of literature relevant to the poem in question is given. There a sketch of the poem's structure as well as of its place in literature and in its time is offered.

NOTES

[1] The most recent discussion of biographical and chronological matters is Aricò's introduction in Traglia-Ar. 16-26 and 125-6, where previous treatments of the subject are discussed. See Kerckhoff 24-31, Vollm. 1-20, Hilberg, Legras 1907, Giri, *SG* IV[10] 290-6, Schanz-Hosius 531-3 and 541-2, Fr. IX-XXVI and 126 n. 1, 126 n. 3, Helm 984-5, 989-90, Speranza 1951 and 1957, Kytzler 1960, Griset, Marastoni 1969, 220-5, Mar. 132-3, Cancik *Forschungsbericht* 2-3.

[2] Vollm. 3 and 32-4. See also II 7 *Intr.* under **IV**.

[3] The date of his birth is much disputed. Estimates vary between 40 A.D. (Vollm. 16) and 60-1 A.D. (Speranza 1957). Nohl (25), Fr. (XVII) and Gossage (1972, 186) put it between 40 and 50. Giri (433-41), and Traglia-Ar. (17) defend 50 as the most plausible time. Arguments for putting Sts.' birth at an early date are three vague statements by St. himself: in the year 94, after a severe illness, he speaks of *senium componere* (III 5, 13); in 95 he contrasts himself with a young friend, stating *vergimur in senium* (IV 4, 70); in the same year or the next one he says *nos fortior aetas iam fugit* (V 2, 158-9). In favour of a later date pleads that the Thebaid has been finished not long before 95 (IV 4, 87 ff., see Fr. XXIV). St. had been working on it for 12 years (*Th.* XII 811). If St. had been born in 40, this would mean that he had not composed more than some parts of the *Silvae* and perhaps other minor work before he was 40 years of age. But St. himself refers to his precocity (V 3, 209 ff., 215 ff., see also n. 11 below and II 2, 6-9n.) and it was usual in his time to start early as a poet (II 1, 113-9n.), as his own father, indeed, had done. Moreover, St. implies that he began work on the Thebaid soon after his marriage, which was contracted when he was *adhuc iuvenile vagantem* (III 5, 25, see III 5, 36).

[4] See Rostagni 1952, d'Arms 165-7, Vessey 1973, 44-5, 51 n. 4, II 2 *Intr.* under **IV.**, II 2, 1-12n., II 6, 24-5n.

[5] V 3, 146-75. See also II 1, 113-9n.

[6] V 3, 133-45. On the *Augustalia*, see II 2, 6-9n. Fr. (X and 198 n. 3) denies that he went to Greece, but see K. Clinton, *Publius Papinius St... at Eleusis* in TAPhA 103 (1972), 79 ff. and Traglia-Ar. 15. On Sts.' father, see Gossage 1965 and Traglia-Ar. 15 n. 2 with literature, *cf.* II 6, 24-5n.

[7] V 3, 209 ff. See Fr. X, Traglia-Ar. 15-6.

[8] V 3, 176-94. See Hilberg, Giri 434, Fr. X-XI, Traglia-Ar. 16.

[9] V 3, 195-204. See Suet. *Dom.* 1, Tac. *Hist.* III 71-4, Fr. 201 n. 1. Domitian too wrote a poem on the subject, see Mart. V 5, 7-8 and Bardon 1940, 281-2.

[10] V 3, 205-8 and 253-4. Giri (442-6) explains V 3, 205-8 as a very vague plan of Papinius for such a poem and thinks that he may have died much later than around 80, but see Traglia-Ar. 16 n. 8 and Kytzler 1960, 342-3.

[11] V 3, 215-8. See Hilberg 517, Fr. X-XI and 201 n. 4, against Vollm. 17 n. 2.

[12] V 3, 219-27. Since St. won this victory in his father's lifetime and the festival was held every four years, 78 is the latest date (see n. 10 above), but the victory may also have been much earlier, see II 1, 113-9n., II 2, 6-9n. On the other hand, St. mentions it after the *Latii patres* (V 3, 215), which suggests that it was after the family had moved to Rome. It is possible that he was also crowned in other *Augustalia* after 78. See also n. 15 and n. 16 below.

[13] V 3, 233-7. See Fr. XIV-XVI, Kytzler 1960, esp. 342-4, Traglia-Ar. 24.

[14] III 5, 35-6, 50-67. See n. 4 above. Claudia was not Neapolitan, see III 5, 6 ff. On St. being childless, see V 5, 79-80, II 1, 72-105n.

[15] For the Alban victory, see III 5, 28-31, IV 2, 63-7, IV 5, 22-8, V 3, 227-30. The manuscript tradition has *ter* in III 5, 28, but *tu* is a certain correction by Poliziano, see IV 2, 64 and V 3, 230. The date is almost certain (but Marastoni 1969, 222 ff. and ed. 132-3 puts it in 86 or earlier). The principal argument is in IV 2, 66-7, where St. describes his poem on the occasion as *cum modo Germanas acies modo Daca sonantem proelia Palladio tua* (Domitian's) *me manus induit auro*: the subject of his prize poem was Domitian's double triumph in the autumn of 89 over the Germans and the Dacians. It seems probable that St. composed his poem in the next spring, not 4 years later, see Vollm. 14 n. 3, Fr. 126 n. 1 (with extensive documentation on these games), Traglia-Ar. 18-9, 125-6. It is very well possible that Sts.' *fragmentum de bello Germanico* is part of this prize poem (and most improbable that it is a part of the epic on Domitian which St. seems to promise in *Th.* I 16 ff.), see Legras 1907, 348 n. 2, esp. Fr. XIV-XVI, Traglia-Ar. 125-6; differently Vollm. 14 and n. 3.

[16] This date is much more doubtful. St. speaks of the *repulsa Capitolina* in III 5, 31-3 and V 3, 231-3. Since he mentions it after the Alban victory in both cases it is probable that it came after that. The Capitoline Games were instituted by Domitian in 86 and took place every 4 years at the end of August. St. complains bitterly that Domitian had grudged him the prize. So only two dates come into question, 90 and 94. Either has its drawbacks: it seems probable that St. tried his luck in the Capitoline Games directly after his Alban victory (Giri 446-7, Traglia-Ar. 19. But Legras 1907, 344 deems this improbable). On the other hand, if St. was beaten in 94, this would explain his wanting to leave Rome in that year (III 5). But IV 1-3 dating from 95 all praise Domitian, especially IV 2, where St. thanks the Emperor for an invitation to dinner in the palace. In IV 2, 62 St. expresses his hopes that Domitian will reign long enough to celebrate many Capitoline Games, alluding to his own Alban victory in the same breath. It seems very improbable that St. would say this so soon after his own failure, if this took place in 94, though Fr. speaks of a '*prompt retour en grâces*' (126 n. 3) and Traglia-Ar. (126 with n. 5) think that this amounts to proof that the poem was composed before the failure—impossible if Fr. is right in dating it in the end of 94 or the beginning of 95. The only difficulty with 90 as the year of the Capitoline failure is that St. was in Sorrento in the summer of that year, in any case up to the 13th of August (II 2, 6-9n.). But it has been argued that St. had time enough to return to Rome after his visit and take part in the games (Kytzler 1960, 350, see Traglia-Ar. 19). Kytzler's theory that the last lines of the Thebaid, where St. mentions *livor*, refer to his failure in the *ludi Capitolini* is attractive: in that case St. would have recited a part of the epic there, which would again point to 90. We must assume that in III 5 (in 93 or perhaps 94) St. is more prepared to vent his bitterness to his wife than in IV 1-3 (in 95) to Domitian. All in all 90 seems somewhat more probable than 94 as the date of Sts.' Capitoline defeat (following Vollm. 19, Giri 446 ff., Kytzler 1960, 350-3, against Kerckhoff 30, Härtel 8, Legras 1907, 343, Fr. 126 n. 3, Traglia-Ar. 126—who apparently revoke their opinion expressed on 19).

[17] III 5, 37-43, 12-3 and *passim*.

[18] IV 2, IV 6 and IV 9 are almost certainly composed in Rome, IV 5 and IV 8 in Alba. IV 3 may be written in Cumae or Pozzuoli, but takes the point of view of a traveller coming from the North, see Fr. XIX-XX and Traglia-Ar. 19-20.

[19] Vollm. 18 and n. 10, Fr. XX, Traglia-Ar. 20.

[20] See n. 4 above. St. is always at pains to point out his special relationship with Naples: I 2, 260-2, II 2, 6-9n., 74-5n., III 5 as a whole, IV *Praef.* 22, IV 4, 51-5, 78-86, IV 7, 17-20, IV 8, 1-15, V 3, 104-75. As Vessey (1973, 45) puts it: 'he was destined to produce an epic based on Greek mythology but written for Roman audiences. His background for the task was appropriate.'

[21] See Vollm. 18 n. 2, 22, 491, Fr. XXXI, Marastoni 1958, 3-7, White 1974, 43 and 48-50, esp. Vessey 1973, 14-28 and White 1982. St. has *cliens* twice in the *Silvae*, but not of himself. *Amicus*: II *Praef.* 15, V 2, 5, *amicitia*: V *Praef.* 10-1. For the position of dependent poets in the first century, see esp. White 1982, who points out that in this age the Maecenas came to be seen more than before as a source of money.

[22] By Vessey 1973, 17.

[23] For retirement and the patronage in Flavian times, see II 2, 26-9n., 26n., 133-9n., Funaioli 437 ff., Fr. XXXI, Vessey 1972, 172-5 and 1973, 16-7, 24-5. White has shown (1974, 50 and esp. 1973) that the friends and patrons of Mart. and St. did not belong to closely knit circles and that they can not have been courted for their political influence: in the *Silvae* only a few ex-consulars and Abascantus of V 1 are in possession of any real power (differently Delarue RPh 1974, 300). See also Traglia-Ar. 21, 23.

According to Juvenal (7, 82 ff.) St. himself recited (parts of) the Thebaid: *curritur ad vocem iucundam et carmen amicae/Thebaidos laetam cum fecit Statius urbem/promisitque diem: tanta dulcedine captos/adficit ille animos tantaque libidine volgi/auditur.* The remark is not friendly, as has often been thought (e.g. by Vollm. 20 n. 4), but sarcastic, see Vessey 1972, 174 n. 1 and 1973, 7 n. 2, Traglia-Ar. 21 with n. 25, all with literature. For St. reciting his poetry, see also n. 11 above and V 2, 161 *et mea Romulei venient ad carmina patres.*

[24] Cancik 1965, 9-11 has collected a number of such negative judgments from authoritative handbooks, see also Vessey 1973, 7. On Domitian as the founder of literary games, see notes 15 and 16 above. Domitian also granted St. the adduction of water for his villa in Alba, see III 1, 61-4 and Fr. 99 n. 3. In his youth Domitian wrote epic poetry and prose. After his accession he became less active in this field, chiefly because he feared to be regarded as a second Nero. Suet. (*Dom.* 20) states that Domitian completely neglected the arts after he had become emperor, but that this is a distortion of the truth is shown by Bardon 1940, 284-8, who also points out that, paradoxically, in the eyes of the Roman people Domitian *did* become a kind of Nero by the institution of the literary games. For Domitian's positive attitude towards St., Mart. and other writers, see Bardon 1940, 308-35 (though his evaluation of Domitian as essentially contemptuous of poets seems too negative).

[25] See II 7, 31-5n., P. Thomas 17-8, Szelest 1966, 191-3, Vessey 1972, 175-6 and 1973, 16-7.

[26] See e.g. Prop. III 4, 1, IV 11, 60, Ov. *Pont.* II 8, *Silv.* I 1, 17 ff., 32 ff., 56 ff., 74, 94 ff., IV 1, 2 ff., IV 2, 40 ff., Wissowa 1912, 78 ff., 93-4. For the imperial cult under Domitian with special regard to St. and Mart., see Scott 1933 and 1936, Sauter, Fr. XX, Cancik 1965, 74-6, 80-1, 102-7, 113-5, Vessey 1973, 6-7. For less unfavourable judgments of Domitian, see Cancik 1965, 14-5 and Vessey 1973, 6 with literature. See also the sensible remarks in Traglia-Ar. 22-3 about Flavian official cultural ideas being less uniform than is often assumed. See also n. 24.

[27] I *Praef.* 6-7 *adhuc pro Thebaide mea, quamvis me reliquerit, timeo.* The choice between 91 and 92 depends on whether or not one accepts Kytzler's (1960) chronology of the Thebaid (80-92); the traditional chronology is 78/9-90/1, see notes 13 and 16 above.

[28] Fr. (XIII-XXV) has established what is more or less a definitive chronology of the individual poems and the separate books of the *Silvae.* He has refuted (after Härtel and Friedländer) Vollmer's false interpretation of IV *Praef.* 2-3, which made Vollm. conclude that the books I, II and III were assembled as a whole (but edited in rapid succession), see Fr. XXI n. 2. Newmyer (46-9, 56-7) has, however, revived the belief that the 3 books belong together, reasoning from the 'tone' of the prefaces, instead of from the meaning of *opusculum* (II *Praef.* 1-5n.), which he himself helps to establish. That the 3 books were planned and issued together is one of the central contentions of Bright (53-75). He fails to convince, especially because the cross-references which he finds are often fanciful and because he tends to see a deliberate structure everywhere, things not fitting a pattern being all the more proof of its existence, see esp. 72-5.

[29] See note on II 1 *titulus.*

[30] This is an other controversial point in the criticism of the *Silvae.* St. claims that he wrote the poem 3 months after his father's death: V 3, 29-31, see n. 10 above. On the other hand, he refers to his Alban victory and his Capitoline failure, neither of which his father did live to see: V 3, 225-33. The dilemma must be solved either by assuming that 29-31 are a fiction, as Vollm. (9 n. 10) and Fr. (XXV) do, or by assuming a double redaction of the poem, where 225-33 are a later insertion, as for instance Traglia-Ar. (25) and Cancik (*Forschungsbericht* § 1) do. The last assumption is more probable: why would St. write a poem on his father's death after 15 years? Moreover, in II 1, 33-4,

dating probably from 91 (Fr. XXII-XXIII), St. mentions the poem and in III 3, 39-40 (from 93) he mentions mourning his father's death (both allusions are denied by Fr. 192 n. 2, because they do not fit his dating of the Capitoline Games in 94. This minor part of the problem would be solved by dating V 3 in 90 or 91, see n. 16 above). And, last of all, St. speaks of the Thebaid in V 3 as if he had just begun work on it (233-8). This would fit the year 80 excellently and Fr. is forced to consider it another, deliberate shattering of the 'fiction' that St. wrote the poem 3 months after his father's death (192 n. 2 end). For the whole question, see also Speranza 1957, Kytzler 1960, 345 with n. 1, Griset, Traglia-Ar. 25 and Cancik *Forschungsbericht* § 1 (whose chronology of Sts.' life is unacceptable).

[31] We probably know the title of at least one poem which has not been included, the *epistola ad Vibium Maximum*, see II *Praef. Introduction*. Whether St. ever wrote the *dignius opusculum* which he promised to Plotius Grypus (IV *Praef.* 24) is impossible to decide. An early work of a quite different character is alluded to by Juv. 7, 87 (St., in spite of his success in reciting the Thebaid) *esurit intactam Paridi nisi vendit Agauen*, see n. 23 above. From this it has been concluded, rightly it seems, that St. wrote a mime called *Agaue*, which was acted by the actor Paris, who died in 83 (see Dio LXVII, Vollm. 15 n. 3, Fr. XII, Traglia-Ar. 24). The wild conjectures of L. Herrmann (1955), who makes St. the author of the 'pre-prologue' of the Aeneid and the epilogue of both the Georgics and Col. X, can be ignored. On the other hand, it may be remarked that there is no way of being certain that V 5, which breaks off in its first part in the manuscripts, was the last poem of Book V, nor, indeed, whether the editor(s) used material for one book only or for more.

[32] See II 2, 6-9n. and Fr. XXII.

[33] For those, see Cancik 1965, 16-7, Newmyer 49-55 (with literature), Bright 50 and n. 110 (with literature).

[34] In accounting for the order of the poems in *Silv.* II I largely follow Cancik 1965, 17-21. Newmyer 55-8 has some additions on the length of poems and on the lack of chronological order, see esp. 55-6, but he neglects subject and theme as an ordering device (Newmyer on the whole tends to underestimate Cancik's merits for criticism of the *Silvae*). Bright's conclusion (60) that all the poems except for II 2 treat of death is wrong (See II 3 *Intr.* n. 6), nor do I believe that the theme of II 2 is exceptional because St. wanted to announce his 3rd book with Pollius as the addressee. It is still harder to agree with Bright that *Silv.* I and II 1 on the one hand and II 6-7 together with III on the other hand are meant by St. to frame II 2-5 'on the wonders of nature' (61). See n. 28.

[35] See II 7 *Praef.* under **II.**

[36] For II *Praef.* 16-9, see II 3 *Intr.*, II 4 *Intr.*, II 5 *Intr.* The argument of 'the average of the other poems' (Cancik 1965, 19) is dangerously close to special pleading, because II 1, for example, is more than twice as long as II 6.

[37] See the *Introductions* to the poems, esp. II 5 *Intr.* under **II.**

[38] See II 6 *Intr.* under **I.**

[39] II 7 *Intr.* under **II.**

[40] See II 1 *Intr.* under **I.** and for their relation to the *genre* II 4 *Intr.* and II 5 *Intr.* (both under **I.**). See also II 2 *Intr.* 5th footnote.

[41] That the collection as a whole was named thus is clear from III *Praef.* 7-8 *tertius hic Silvarum nostrarum liber*, IV *Praef.* 26 *in quarto Silvarum*, Sid. *carm.* 22 *ep.* 6 *de Papinii nostri silvulis*, Prisc. III 10, 21 (*K*) *Statius...in primo Silvarum*. See also Vacca's *Vita Lucani* 336, 18 (*Hosius*) *Silvarum X*. See Fr. XXVII-XXVIII *'les Silves ne sont ni un genre, ni un espèce littéraire, mais un titre'*, see § 4 and notes 51-4 below.

[42] The most important testimony is, I think, Gel. *Praef.* 5-6 *quia variam et miscellam et quasi confusaneam doctrinam conquisiverant eo titulos quoque ad eam sententiam exquisitissimos indiderunt. Namque alii Musarum scripserunt, alii Silvarum...partim* Λειμῶνας, *quidam Lectionis suae, alius Antiquarum Lectionum atque alius* Ἀνθηρῶν *at item alius* Εὑρημάτων...*est praeterea qui Pratum...scripserit.* As it is seen Gellius connects *Silvae* with variation in content, not with speedy composition, see Newmyer 7 and Delarue 1974 (Latomus), 544 ff., against Fr. XXXII. Similarly Suetonius wrote an encyclopaedia called *Pratum* or *Prata* (Isid. *Nat.* 44, Prisc. III 375, 14 (*K*)) and a certain Ateius Philologus a work in 80 books called *Hylas*

(ὕλη), Valerius Probus a *Silva observationum sermonis antiqui* (Suet. *Gram.* 10 and 24), *cf.* Suid. Πάμφιλος (142)· ἔγραφε λειμῶνα, ἔστι δὲ ποικίλων περιοχή. See also Plin. *Nat. Praef.* 24-6.

The fact that *silva* in the schools of rhetoric and in the mouths of orators had become a term for a rough draft, composed at great speed, a development of the word's use for 'rough materials' as a translation of Greek ὕλη, has been exploited by critics ('rough material' e.g. in Cic. *De Orat.* I 34, III 93, *Orat.* 139, Isid. *Orig.* XIII 3, 1): e.g. Newmyer 3-7, see also Cancik 1965, 9-12 and n. 102. The central passage for *silva* in rhetorical theory is Quint. *Inst.* X 3, 17 *eorum vitium qui primo decurrere per materiam stilo velocissimo volunt, et sequentes calorem atque impetum scribunt. Hanc silvam vocant. Repetunt deinde et componunt quae effunderant; sed verba emendantur et numeri, manet in rebus temere congestis quae fuit, levitas.* The singular alone shows that this is not an oblique hit at St.: a *silva* is not 'one poem in the *Silvae*', see above and Fr. XXXIII against Vollm. 25 and Klotz 1909. Moreover, Quintilian speaks of rhetors, not of poets. For the lack of animosity between Quint. and St., see esp. Delarue 1974 (Latomus), 544 ff. The fact that St. called his collection *Silvae* is almost enough to preclude a connection with this passage. See also II *Praef.* 8-13n.

Neither is it wise to connect the title *Silvae* with the connotation *silva diffusa et inculta*, as contrasted with *nemus composita multitudo arborum* (Serv. on Verg. *A.* I 312), as is done, for instance, by Fr. XXXIV, after Ribbeck (for the contrary view, that *silva* refers to an ordered wood, see Gothein, who is refuted by Klotz 1909). See also the literature quoted in Cancik 1965 n. 2. The only association with a real wood is perhaps that the trees grow in as much variation as Sts.' poems, see Delarue 1974 (Latomus), 544 ff.

Bright (20-49) gives a survey of the above and other possible meanings of *silva*, but he handles the material in a perverse fashion: in the first place he seems to suggest that all the connotations of the word *silva* which are possible are equally valid for explaining what *Silvae* meant to St. and his contemporaries. Thus we are expected to explain the title both as a reference to a disordered wood and to an ordered park, as well as a mass *and* raw material *and* collected material *and* an improvisation *and* an allusion to bucolic poetry *and* an allusion to Sts.' treatment of the theme of nature. He misinterprets Gel. *Praef.* 5-9 in stating that Gel. quotes titles which connote order and artistry (34). He becomes fanciful when he equates *silva* in Vergil's Eclogues with 'song' (37 ff.) and even more so when he connects Sts.' juxtaposition of art and nature (in itself a correct observation, see notes 37 and 72) with the title *Silvae*: in the same way as St. makes *silva* refer to 'elaborate disarray', he prefers natural beauty reworked by the hands of man (42 ff.).

[43] See II *Praef.* 8-13n., I *Praef.* 18 ff., where St. says that I 2 took two days to compose, I 1 and 3 one day each and I 5 and 6 less than that. For Sts.' fear that his poetry is not good enough, see II *Praef.* 8-13n., II 3 *Intr.* under I., II 3, 6-7n., 62-3n., II 7, 54-5n., I *Praef.* 1-10, II *Praef.* 14, III *Praef.* 1-5.

[44] For *prolusio*, see n. 43 above and Fr. XXVIII, 33 n. 2, 135 n. 8.

[45] III *Praef.* 3-4 *multos* (sc. *libellos*) *ex illis in sinu tuo subito natos*, see Delarue 1974 (Latomus) 344. Of a number of poems St. does not say that he composed them very quickly and in some cases there is no reason why he should have done so: II 2, 3, esp. 6 and 7, III 2, 3, 5, all poems of IV. It seems reasonable, though, to assume that those poems which describe a visit or a dinner party were ready at the end of it (II 2, *cf.* II 4, IV 1, 2, 6, 9).

[46] E.g. Vollm. 27-30, Fr. XXIX, Schanz-Hosius 540, see many others in Cancik 1965, 9-11 and Newmyer 8-9, *cf.* II 1, 2n.

[47] The craftsmanship of St. has been brought out esp. by Cancik (1965 and all his subsequent work on the *Silvae*) and Newmyer. See also Friedrich 1963, 46, Argenio 194, Traglia 1967, all rightly doubting the reality of improvisation. For Sts.' careful construction and development of themes, see in this book esp. the *Introductions* to the poems, also e.g. II 2, 26n., 45-62n., 107-54n., II 7, 21-3n., 41-104n., 41-80n.

[48] For recitations as a means of publication, see II *Praef. Intr.* and for St. reciting, see n. 11 and n. 23 above. Since ancient poetry was meant to be read aloud, this could be true for II 2, 3, 6, 7, III 2, 3, 5, IV 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, see n. 45.

[49] See White 1964, 41-50, who points out that Sts.' use of *libellus* may also suggest separate editions (for which the format of the poems in the *Silvae* is ideal), see II *Praef. Intr.*, 15-9n.

[50] See the notes quoted in n. 43.

[51] See Cairns 1972, 6 and *cf.* the '*Haupttopoi*' in II 1 *Intr.* under **I.**, the reversed order of these in II 4 (*Intr.* under **I.**) and II 5 (*ibid.*).

[52] See Newmyer 19-44, Cairns 1972, 73-4, 90-1, 283, 310-2, Bright 6-12. Neither IV 7 nor IV 8 is primarily a *genethliacon*, in spite of Newmyer 24 ff., see II 7 *Intr.* n. 1, Fr. 162 n. 2. *Ecloga* and *epistula* (Newmyer 31-4) are no genres according to the definition by Cairns. There is no reason to suppose that '*epyllia*' influenced St., *pace* Bishop 1951, *cf.* II 2, 85-93n.

[53] See II 7 *Intr.* under **II.**

[54] Esp. the *consolatio* and the *genethliacon*, see the examples quoted in II 1 *Intr.* and II 7 *Intr.* Lucan may well have introduced the stichic hexameter in these poems, *cf.* II 7 *Intr.* under **II.** But even in that case, I think that St. is emulating most of all Ovid's elegiacs, see II 3 *Intr.* and II 4 *Intr.*

[55] In the first place, mythology and encomium are so important in the poems (see below) that they influence their structure: for instance the emphasis on *laudatio* in the *consolationes* (see II 6, 21-57n.), the treatment of the descriptions of I 1, 3, 5, II 2, IV 6, which all aim as much at praising the owner as at describing (see n. 63 below). Moreover, St. pays almost no attention to some constant themes of the *epithalamium* (I 2, see Fr. XXXI). Of the *soteria* (I 4) it has been concluded that 'the material...if not its treatment, is close to the material of the rhetorical treatment for soteria' (Cairns 1972, 154, see n. 59 below). For Statian innovations in the *propempticon*, see Cairns 1972, 154 n. 3 and 162-3. One of the so-called *genethliaca*, IV 7 (see n. 52 above), is a Horatian ode in form. For innovations in the *consolationes*, see II 1 *Intr.* under **I.**, the 'pseudo-*consolationes*' II 4, 5, 7 (*Introductions* to the poems), II 1, 189-90n. See also II 3, 62-3n., II 4, 22-3n., Bright 6-10.

[56] See the *Introductions* to the poems.

[57] E.g. Leo, Lohrisch, Vollm. 27 n. 2, 31 n. 3, 214, 234 ff., 263, 316-7, Cesareo, Szelest 1966, 189. See II 1 *Intr.* under **I.** n. 1.

[58] A reaction set in with P. Friedländer 1912, see e.g. Geissler, Fr. XXIX-XXXI, Marastoni 1958, 7 ff., Cancik 1965 notes 24-8 and *passim*, Szelest 1972, 89-90. Cairns (1972, 36) points out that 'even if rhetoric is left out of the question completely, the generic patterns can be traced quite independently through poetic examples in unbroken lines to Homer', but he still puts too much weight on rhetoric, I think. In this respect he is followed by Newmyer 15-44. See II 1, 36-136n., II 2 *Intr.* under **I.** and **II.** and below.

[59] Cairns 1972, 49-50. By the nature of the evidence he can not prove the influence of rhetorical theory on first-century poetry. See also II 1 *Intr.* Kierdorf 82 ff. and 134-5 shows that a fundamental change in the Roman *laudatio funebris* took place in the 3rd. century A.D. and not earlier, under the influence of Greek rhetorical theory.

[60] It is true that poetry and oratory were not as sharply different in antiquity as the two are felt to be nowadays, as e.g. Newmyer (17-8) and Traglia-Ar. (22) point out. On the other hand, to say that poetry can be analysed, divided and classified with the aid of rhetorical rules, which is true, is quite different from suggesting that poetry must be composed in the same way as a speech, which is not true, and denied by Menander. The aims of poets and rhetoricians are different. It is rhetoric which draws on poetry (see Menander 434, 10 ff. and Soffel) not *vice versa*, except that ancient poets had been very well instructed in the use of commonplaces and themes at school. See also II 1, 36-136n., II 2, 85-93n., Fr. XXXI '*pleines de rhétorique, les Silves échappent aux schèmes de la rhétorique*', 24 n. 4, 31 n. 5, 157 n. 2, Cancik 1965 n. 28.

[61] 'Descriptive poems' are above all I 1, 3, 5, II 2, 3, IV 3, 6. See also I 6 and IV 2. But see also in the 2nd book e.g. II 1, 42-66, 106-19, 191-207, II 4, 11-5, II 6, 21-47.

[62] See II 2 *Intr.* under **II.**, also II 1, 92-3n., 178-82n., II 4, 11-5n., Fr. XXX, 14 n. 1.

[63] See esp. Cancik 1965, 34-7 and notes 25 ('*Das Sachliche wird transzendiert, indem es durch die "Beschreibung" mit dem Mythos, dem Kaiserkult oder den jeweiligen Besitzern der*

Kunstwerke...in Verbindung gebracht wird'), 74, 100, 116. For the second book, see II 2 *Intr.* under **II.** for the symbolic value of the poem, II 2, 26n., II 3 *Intr.* under **II.** and **III.**, where the multiple influences on and layers of meaning in the poem are indicated. For mythology, see II 1, 88-102n.

[64] See II 1, 36-136n., 42n., 92-3n., 94-5n., 97-8n., 131-5n., 157-9n., 144-5n., 169-72n., 178-82n., II 2, 9-12n., 42-4n., 45-9n., 48-9n., 49-51n., 63-72n., 85-93n., 92-3n., 100-4n., II 3, 8-34n., II 4, 4-7n., 11-5n., 26-8n., II 5, 11-3n., 19-23n., II 6, 8-9n., 25-8n., 30-3n., 34-5n., 43-5n., 100-2n., II 7, 98-9n., Bardon 1962.

[65] Curtius 277 ff. Essentially the use of the concept is a product of Wölfflin's '*wechselseitige Erhellung der Kunste*'. Examples of similar uses of mannerism before Curtius are found in Lange 149-50 and n. 4, Raimondi 58-9 and n. 7. For its application to first-century literature, see e.g. Burck, Schetter, Cancik (esp. 1965, 38-63 and n. 28), Friedrich 1963 and 1965, Wanke, Vessey (esp. 1973, 7-14). Grotesque: Hocke 1957 and 1959, *cf.* Cancik 1965, n. 32. Curtius' concrete examples for the *Silvae* are not always happy, see II 7, 12-5n., 85-6n.

[66] E.g. Crahay, H. Bardon, *A propos de Perse. Surréalisme et collage.* In: Latomus 34 (1975), 675 ff. See also the same author *ibid.* 319-35. For similar problems of definition, see Friedrich 1963, 35-6, Lange 19-20, A. M. Boase, *The Definition of Mannerism.* In: Actes du III[e] Congrès de l'Ass. Intern. de Litt. Comp. (Utrecht 21-26 VIII 1961) (Den Haag 1962), 143 ff.

[67] See e.g. Cancik 1965, 38-40, Burck *passim.* A disastrous course is taken by those deriving the two kinds of mannerism from the two kinds of Asianism as described in Cic. *Brut.* 325-6: Asianism is not the antipole of 'the classical' (and Atticism is not classical, but classicist). The two kinds of Asianism can only be adapted to mannerism by distorting them, since Cicero speaks of rhetoric (and has much to say of prose-rhythm in this passage), not of poetry.

[68] For problems, see (apart from the literature in note 66) most essays in Ed. W. Barner, *Der literarische Barockbegriff* (Darmstadt 1975), Kunisch, Kytzler 1967 (who answers in the negative). As regards arbitrarily enumerating figures an exception must be made for the intelligent work of Wanke.

[69] As far as the *Silvae* are concerned much has (again) been done by Cancik. See II 1, 36-136n., 44-5n., 47n., II 2, 45-9n., II 3 *Intr.* under **II.** and **III.**, II 5, 16-23n., II 6, 38-47n.

[70] See the *Introductions* to the poems.

[71] See II 1, 88-102n. (also for the closure-function of mythology), 157-82n., 178-82n., II 2 *Intr.* under **I.**, 95-7n., 100-6n., II 3 *Intr.* under **III.**, 53-61n., II 6, 21-57n., 25-33n. For Sts.' erudition, see Venini. For our aesthetic appreciation of Sts.' mythology our judgment on Propertius may well be one of the most important factors.

[72] For the contrast Nature/Culture, see above and note 37. For Sts.' 'philosophy of progress', see II 1, 113-9n., II 2, 52-62n., II 3, 56-7n., Pavlovskis 1973, Bright 42-9. It is also implied in his personification of living things, see II 2, 49-51n., 50-1n., also II 1, 78-82n.

[73] It will be noticed that a.o. the work of Axelson has been of much use. The emphasis on Sts.' vocabulary must not be interpreted to imply that I equate vocabulary with style. Whatever definition of style is followed, in my opinion stylistics are a comparative, quantitative discipline, which can only bear fruit if statistics in the mathematical sense of the word are applied. The individual style of an author is represented by the whole complex of points in which his way of writing is different from that of others. In this respect I follow Enkvist 1-26. For an introduction to the ways in which such research may be done, see Muller and the sequel by the same author *Principes et méthodes de la statistique lexicale* (Paris 1977). For an example of an application, see L. T. Milic, *A Quantitative Approach to the Style of Jonathan Swift* (The Hague/Paris 1967). Seen in this light my commentary can do no more than providing some raw material towards a definition of Sts.' style.

[74] Most scholars judge differently: see II 1, 2n. with the other references, II 3, 64-5n.

[75] See II 1, 47-8n., 169-72n., II 2, 68-72n., II 3, 22-3n.

[76] See II 1, 128-30n., II 2, 42-4n., 68-72n. and for possible carelessness in repeating sounds II 1, 48-9n., 69-72n.

[77] On omitting the copula, see II 7, 31-5n.; on avoiding common words, see II 1, 87-8n., 101-2n., II 4, 29-30n.

[78] See Schamberger and Speranza 1956. As regards being certain whether a neologism is invented by St. or whether an existing word is first used in a new sense by St., see Schamberger's cautious remarks (231-5, 327). The epics are about three times as long as the *Silvae*. St. has 79 neologisms in the *Silvae* and 142 in the epics. In the *Silvae* 27 words which must be explained in a new way occur and 55 in the epics (Schamberger counts only words *quibus plane nova vis et priori dispar subiecta est* (232)). In the *Silvae* 51 words occur for the first time in poetry, in the epics 42 (the picture is distorted here by the many new words in the lyrics, 26 in total, but even then there are more of those words in the *Silvae*). The relative novelty of the *Silvae* may be a factor, but this also implies that St. is an innovator. The only neologisms which are more frequent in the epics are compounds. See Schamberger 327-8 and II 1, 94-5n., II 2, 118-20n., also II 6, 82-4n. The additions by Speranza do not fundamentally affect these figures.

[79] See II 3, 12-4n. and Cancik *Forschungsbericht* § 2.

[80] I refer only to the second book, where all poems are hexametric except for II 7, but that has a solemn tone which is new for this metre. So differences between hexametric, hendecasyllabic and alcaic poems are not touched upon here. For *ire*: II 1, 215-7n., *-anus*: II 7, 73-4n., *merx*: II 1, 73, *strangulare*: II 2, 150, *noli*: II 7, 31-5n., *bilis*: II 1, 58-9n., *tamquam*: II 3, 9-10n., *volenti*: II 6, 15-7n., *gladiator*: II 5, 26 (in one of the very few formal Homeric comparisons in the *Silvae*), *census*: II 6, 60, *diaeta* (not an obvious thing to occur in epic): II 2, 81-2n. Cancik *Forschungsbericht* § 2 quotes some less clear examples. See also II 6, 52-3n., 55-7n.

[81] *Lassus/fessus*: II 1, 15-7n., *licet/quamvis*: II 6, 97-8n., *fortasse/forsan* (and *forsitan*): II 6, 100-2n., *facundus*: II 1, 88, *ob*: II 6, 76-9n.

[82] *Quid* (*ni*)*si*: II 6, 21n., *procul*: II 6, 6-8n., size/quantity: II 1, 218-20n., *tunc/tum*: II 3, 49n., *quis/quibus*: II 4, 16-7n., *quamquam*: II 1, 144-5n. See also II 1, 3-7n., II 3, 1-5n. (*ceu*), 5-11n. (*penes*), 26-30n., 48n., II 4, 3n., 4n. On the postposition of *sed*, where St. follows Vergil, and *nec*, see II 1, 82-6n., II 6, 92-3n.

[83] Imitation or influence mainly in II 3, see *Intr.* there. Parody: II 3, 35-42n., II 4, 24-5n. *Non vulgare loqui*: V 3, 214. On the similarity in metre between the epics and the *Silvae*, see Arbeitsgruppe für lateinische Metrik and Cancik *Forschungsbericht* § 2.

[84] *Blandus*: II 1, 45-6n., *hilaris*: II 1, 56-7n., *mitis*: II 1, 128-30n., *penes*: II 3, 5-11n., etymologies (in themselves part of Latin poetical tradition): II 2, 21-5n., 36-42n.

[85] II 1, 8-12n.

[86] II 6, 10-2n.

[87] II 1, 124-5n., 137-9n., II 6, 8-9n. See also II 1, 10-2n., 202-5n., II 6, 25-8n.

[88] II 2, 104-6n., II 3, 37n., 39-42n., II 6, 42-3n.

[89] II 6, 86-9n.

[90] II 1, 3-7n., 23-5n., 42n., 72-5n., 169-72n., 175-8n., 175-82n., 194-8n., II 3, 40n., 58n., 60n., II 6, 48-53n., 92-3n.

[91] II 3, 12-4n.

[92] II 1, 21-2n., 50n. and the references there. For Vergilian and Ovidian formulas, see II 2, 64n., 72-5n.

[93] More research may yield interesting results. The *Silvae* were apparently not, as has often been stated, completely unknown in the Middle Ages: Charlemagne imitates the first line of IV 4 in a poetical epistle: *curre per Ausonios non segnis epistula campos* (the only difference with St. is that St. has *Euboicos*), see O. Mueller, 1863, 189, B. Bischoff, *Die Hofbibliothek Karls des Grossen.* In: Ed. W. Braunfels & B. Bischoff, *Karl der Grosse II* (1965, s.l.), 42-62, where it is made credible that the Silvae were in Charlemagne's library, Cancik *Forschungsbericht* § 4.4. Perhaps the *Silvae* are meant in the 9th-century catalogue of Reichenau, where *Ovidii Metamorfoseon; Silii et Stacii volumen I* are mentioned. This just might be (an ancestor of) the manuscript containing Manilius, Silius and the *Silvae* found by Poggio in 1417 (see below), see Klotz ed. 1900 LXXVII-VIII, Goold 1956, 9,

Thielscher 1957, 51, Cancik *Forschungsbericht* § 4.4. Bilanovitch (157 n. 1, 159 ff., 177) has made it probable that the Padovan pre-humanists knew and imitated the *Silvae*. Ps.-Boethius *Discipl. Scol.* 1 refers to *Statii urbanitas*, which reminds of the *Silvae* rather than of the epics. Finally there is the case of L, a 10th-century manuscript containing a.o. *Silvae* II 7 (see below).

[94] The facts are set out in virtually all the prefaces to editions of the *Silvae*. For the controversial points in my representation, see below. For Poliziano's work on the *Silvae*, see Poliziano 1498 and 1978, Wasserstein 1956, Pastore Stocchi, Cesarini Martinelli, Marastoni ed. LVI ff., where it is a.o. shown that Poliziano used his manuscript before 1480. Readings of which Poliziano explicitly says that he has taken them from the *liber Poggii* are generally designated with A*, his other marginal variants with A.

[95] M (as it is usually called) was collated by A. Souter, CR 12 (1898), 400-6, 441-5, CR 13 (1899), 35, corrected by M. Krohn, see Vollm. 38 ff., Kl. VI ff. Fundamental: Engelmann 1902. For the relation between the other manuscripts, see Mar. XC and the important corrections by Reeve.

[96] The literature is immense. Apart from the prefaces to the editions from Vollmer's onwards, see Courtney 1966, Dunston, Engelmann 1902 and 1903, Garrod 1913 (twice), Goold 1956, Klotz 1903 and 1910, Lotito, Marastoni 1956, Postgate 1902, 1903, 1913, Reeve, Rizzo, Slater 1918, Thielscher 1907, 1927, 1956, 1957, Traglia 1960, 1971, Vollmer 1903, Wachsmuth, Wasserstein 1953, 1958 and the literature quoted in n. 95.

The problems are approached from all possible points of view and since they all are connected the solution of one problem often means that other in themselves valuable remarks on other points can not at the same time be true. For instance: I 4, 86a is a gloss: Phillimore, Goold. Or it had been forgotten by the scribe: Saenger, Courtney. Or *hic versus deest* means 'there is (half) a line too much here' (!): Pastore Stocchi. *Intercisos* in V 5 does not refer to a hole: Traglia, Courtney (on this hole, see also Fr. 1943 LXIII and Dunston 98). Poggio brought the original manuscript with him when he returned from Switzerland after all (the word *Germania* is also good for problems, for Poliziano elsewhere refers to the manuscript as brought by Poggio *e Gallia*): Phillimore. Another manuscript of the *Silvae* circulated in Italy, a really old one, which Poliziano falsely connected with Poggio: Wasserstein 1953. It is also disputed whether and how many readings in Poliziano's manuscript diverge so much from M as to point to a different tradition. A decision is not easy, because a strict distinction between Poliziano's emendations and the readings in his manuscript is sometimes impossible.

[97] See e.g. Klotz, Phillimore, Frère, Reeve, Traglia-Ar. 102. Whether the corrector of M can be shown to be Poggio himself (as Klotz, for instance, thought) is much more open to doubt, see Mar. VIII-IX.

[98] That Poliziano refers to M and was either stupid or lying or meant something else than we might think at first sight was assumed by Clark, CR 13 (1899), 128, Thielscher 1907 and 1957, Klotz LXXXIX, Dunston. For a refutation, see e.g. Phillimore's witty *Praefatio* XV.

[99] This is the solution of Traglia (see e.g. Traglia-Ar. 101 ff.) and Pastore Stocchi, also accepted by Rizzo 160-1. It seems plausible. That Poliziano saw a copy of M was already held by Klotz. Traglia (in Traglia-Ar. 101-2) rather thinks that M and Poliziano's manuscript were brothers (since he does not accept the identification of M with Poggio's apographon).

[100] See II 7 *Intr.* under **VI.** and Mar. LX-LXV.

[101] See Willis (with deadly criticism of 19th- and 20th-century conservative criticism) and Traglia ed. VI (it is unclear why he claims in Traglia-Ar. 101 that Poggio's definition of the scribe as *ignorantissimus omnium viventium...divinare oportet non legere* does not fit the condition of M). Much has been gathered and dealt with in an appropriate manner in Håkanson's penetrating book (1969).

P. PAPINI STATI

SILVARUM
LIBER SECUNDUS

CONSPECTVS SIGLORVM

L	=	codex Laurentianus plut. 2932
L^1L^2	=	eiusdem codicis manus emendatrices
M	=	codex Matritensis Bibl. Nation. 3678
M^1M^2m	=	eiusdem codicis manus emendatrices
F	=	codex Oxoniensis Bibl. Bodl. Auct. F 5,5
F^1f	=	eiusdem codicis manus emendatrices
G	=	codex Vallicellianus C. 95
G^1G^2	=	eiusdem codicis manus emendatrices
H	=	codex Vatic. Regin. Lat. 1976
H^1h	=	eiusdem codicis manus emendatrices
I	=	codex Vatic. Lat. 3875
I^1i	=	eiusdem codicis manus emendatrices
K	=	codex Vatic. Lat. 3282
K^1K^c	=	eiusdem codicis manus emendatrices
Q	=	codex Vatic. Lat. 3283
Q^1Q^2q	=	eiusdem codicis manus emendatrices
R	=	codex Wratislav. Rehdiger. 125
R^1R^2	=	eiusdem codicis manus emendatrices
B	=	codex Budensis Bibl. Nation. Vindobon. 140
$B^1B^sB^r$	=	eiusdem codicis manus emendatrices
S	=	codex Vindobon. Bibl. Nation. 76
s	=	eiusdem codicis manus emendatrix
U	=	codex Vatic. Urbinas Lat. 649
U^1u	=	eiusdem codicis manus emendatrices
a	=	editio princeps a. 1472 Venetiis impressa
b	=	editio Parmensis a. 1473 impressa
c	=	editio Calderiniana altera a Pannartio a. 1475 impressa
ε	=	codex Florent. Bibl. Nation. Magl. VII, 973, quo commentarius Politiani in Silvas continetur
ε*	=	eiusdem commentarii lectiones quae apertum Poggiani libri testimonium exhibent
β	=	epistola Politiani ad Beroaldum kal. April. a. 1494 missa
α	=	lectiones quas Politianus a. 1480-1494 in exemplar Corsinianum editionis principis Calderinianae intulit
A	=	lectiones in idem exemplar a Politiano inlatae post inspectum Poggii librum at nulla peculiari nota insignitae
A*	=	lectiones eiusdem exemplaris apertam memoriam Poggiani libri exhibentes
Δ	=	lectiones quas Politianus e cod. Laur. 2932 erutas in exemplar Corsinianum transtulit
σ	=	omnes vel complures codices a M manantes saec. XV

LIST OF DEVIATIONS FROM MARASTONI'S EDITION (Leipzig 1970^2, Teubner)[1]

	Marastoni	This text
II 1, 5	*consero*	*confero*: Domitius
II 1, 28	*: †et diu†*	*, sed tu*: Vollmer, Vahlen
II 1, 39	*, hinc*	*ac*: Courtney
II 1, 51	*brachiaque et*	*brachia quo*: Saenger

II 1, 71	*dulces...curae*	*dulcis...cura*: Elter
II 1, 84	*animis*	*hominum*: scripsi
II 1, 113	*gratus*	*Graius*: cod. I
II 1, 116	*fregisset*	*pressisset*: mBσ
II 1, 155	*subivit*	*subibit*: scripsi
II 1, 158	*loquor*	*loquar*: Domitius
II 1, 172	*lambis*	*labris*: Peerlkamp
II 1, 176	*Molvius*	*Mulvius*: Vollmer
II 1, 178	*traditur et*	*traditur. Et*: iam apud Baehrens
II 1, 182	*anguis*	*ignis*: Koestlin
II 1, 230	*ferae*	*serae*: Scaliger, Housman
II 2, 86-87	*quot...quot*	*quod...quod*: M
II 2, 93	*spectare*	*superare*: Waller
II 2, 118	*rapidi*	*rabidi*: σ
II 2, 137	*plectrique*	*plebisque*: scripsi
II 2, 155	*concordia*	*Concordia*: iam apud Markland
II 3, 2	*quae*	*cur...?*: Postgate
II 3, 9	*et*	*it*: σ
II 3, 16	*flavos*	*fluxos*: Scriverius
II 3, 29	*laevamque soporae*	*laevumque soporem*: σ , M
II 3, 53	*animata*	†*animata*†: M, obelos apposuit Saenger
II 3, 69	*secrete, palam*	*secrete palam*: Domitius
II 3, 71	*comere*	*promere*: anon. XV saec.
II 4, 17	*natura*	*Natura*: iam apud Markland
II 4, 18	*demittere*	*dimittere*: M
II 5, 12	*clausas...portas*	*clausis...portis*: anon. ante 1580
II 5, 28	*e*	*a*: Baehrens, Phillimore
II 6, 3	*pignera*	*pignora*: Vulg.
II 6, 6	*alte haec tamen at*	*alte tamen, at*: Vollmer
II 6, 13	*diesque*	†*diesque*†: M, obelos apposui
II 6, 14	*heu*	*ei*: σ
II 6, 16	*sibique*	*sibi ipse*: Heinsius
II 6, 31	*Achillen*	*Achillem*: M
II 6, 39	*post*	*quos*: Baehrens
II 6, 42	*bellis iam casside, visu*	*bellans sine casside visu*: Postgate, Adrian
II 6, 48	*nam*	*non*: scripsi
II 6, 48	*pudor unde notae,*	*pudor ingenuae*: Heinsius
II 6, 50	*quo pandisse queam?*	†*quo potasse queam*†: M, obelos apposui
II 6, 62	*Locroe*	*Locri*: Markland
II 6, 64	*Lucanus Acir*	†*Lucanus ager*†: M, obelos apposui
II 6, 70	*carcer*	*limine*: Markland
II 6, 78	*et invidia, mortemque*	*ab invidia mortisque*: Baehrens
II 6, 79	*quinta...ora*	*quinto...ortu*: Schrader
II 6, 83	*sibi saeva*	*tibi salva*: M, Polster
II 6, 93	*et ipse iuvat*	*-et ipse iuvat-*: Vollmer
II 6, 100	*illi*	*illic*: M
II 6, 105	*amari*	*amorem*: corr. cod. Q
II 7, 53	*exeris*	*exeres*: Markland
II 7, 93	*gnatum*	*natum*: codd. G^{1}HIKQ
II 7, 111	*reclusi*	*reclusum*: Markland
II 7, 112	*Elysii...in oris*	*Elysiis...in oris*: Markland
II 7, 128	*at*	*ac*: M
II 7, 132	*genialis*	*genitalis*: M

[1] Minor differences in punctuation and spelling have not been listed.

P. PAPINI STATI SILVARUM LIBER SECUNDUS

STATIUS MELIORI SUO SALUTEM

Et familiaritas nostra qua gaudeo, Melior, vir optime nec minus in iudicio litterarum quam in omni vitae colore tersissime, et ipsa opusculorum quae tibi trado condicio sic posita est ut totus hic ad te liber meus etiam sine epistola spectet. Primum enim habet Glauciam nostrum, cuius gratissima infantia, et qualem plerumque infelices sortiuntur—apud te complexus amabam—iam non tibi. Huius amissi recens vulnus, ut scis, epicedio prosecutus sum adeo festinanter ut excusandam habuerim affectibus tuis celeritatem. Nec nunc eam apud te iacto qui nosti, sed et ceteris indico, ne quis asperiore lima carmen examinet et a confuso scriptum et dolenti datum, cum paene supervacua sint tarda solacia. Polli mei villa Surrentina quae sequitur debuit a me vel in honorem eloquentiae eius diligentius dici, sed amicus ignovit. In arborem certe tuam, Melior, et psittacum scis a me leves libellos quasi epigrammatis loco scriptos. Eandem exigebat stili facilitatem leo mansuetus, quem in amphitheatro prostratum frigidum erat sacratissimo Imperatori ni statim traderem. Ad Ursum quoque nostrum, iuvenem candidissimum et sine iactura desidiae doctissimum, scriptam de amisso puero consolationem super ea quae ipsi debeo huic libro libenter inserui, quia honorem eius tibi laturus accepto est. Cludit volumen genethliacon Lucani, quod Polla Argentaria, rarissima uxorum, cum hunc diem forte consuleremus imputari sibi voluit. Ego non potui maiorem tanti auctoris habere reverentiam quam quod laudes eius dicturus hexametros meos timui.

Haec qualiacumque sunt, Melior carissime, si tibi non displicuerint, a te publicum accipiant; si minus, ad me revertantur.

I

GLAUCIAS ATEDII MELIORIS DELICATUS

Quod tibi praerepti, Melior, solamen alumni
improbus ante rogos et adhuc vivente favilla
ordiar? Abruptis etiam nunc flebile venis
vulnus hiat magnaeque patet via lubrica plagae,
cum iam egomet cantus et verba medentia saevus
confero, tu planctus lamentaque fortia mavis
odistique chelyn surdaque averteris aure.
Intempesta cano: citius me tigris abactis
fetibus orbatique velint audire leones.
Nec si tergeminum Sicula de virgine carmen
affluat aut silvis chelys intellecta ferisque,
mulceat insanos gemitus. Stat pectore demens
luctus et admoto latrant praecordia tactu.
Nemo vetat: satiare malis aegrumque dolorem
libertate doma. Iam flendi expleta voluptas,
iamque preces fessus non indignaris amicas?
Iamne canam? Lacrimis en et mea carmine in ipso
ora natant tristesque cadunt in verba liturae.
Ipse etenim tecum nigrae sollemnia pompae
spectatumque Urbi scelus et puerile feretrum
produxi; saevos damnati turis acervos
plorantemque animam supra sua funera vidi;
teque patrum gemitus superantem et brachia matrum
complexumque rogos ignemque haurire parantem
vix tenui similis comes offendique tenendo.
Et nunc heu vittis et frontis honore soluto
infaustus vates versa mea pectora tecum
plango lyra, sed tu comitem sociumque doloris,
si merui luctusque tui consortia sensi,
iam lenis patiare precor: me fulmine in ipso
audivere patres; ego iuxta busta profusis
matribus atque piis cecini solacia natis,
et mihi, cum proprios gemerem defectus ad ignes
—quem, Natura!—patrem. Nec te lugere severus
arceo, sed confer gemitus pariterque fleamus.
Iamdudum dignos aditus laudumque tuarum,
o merito dilecte puer, primordia quaerens
distrahor. Hinc anni stantes in limine vitae

ac me forma rapit, rapit inde modestia praecox
et pudor et tenero probitas maturior aevo.
O ubi purpureo suffusus sanguine candor
sidereique orbes radiataque lumina caelo
et castigatae collecta modestia frontis
ingenuique super crines mollisque decorae
margo comae? Blandis ubinam ora arguta querelis
osculaque impliciti vernos redolentia flores
et mixtae risu lacrimae penitusque loquentis
Hyblaeis vox mixta favis? Cui sibila serpens
poneret et saevae vellent servire novercae.
Nil veris adfingo bonis. Heu lactea colla,
brachia quo nunquam domini sine pondere cervix!
O ubi venturae spes non longinqua iuventae,
atque genis optatus honos iurataque multum
barba tibi? Cuncta in cineres gravis intulit hora
hostilisque dies: nobis meminisse relictum.
Quis tua colloquiis hilaris mulcebit amatis
pectora, quis curas mentisque arcana remittet?
Accensum quis bile fera famulisque tumentem
leniet ardentique in se deflectet ab ira?
Inceptas quis ab ore dapes libataque vina
auferet et dulci turbabit cuncta rapina?
Quis matutinos abrumpet murmure somnos
impositus stratis abitusque morabitur artis
nexibus atque ipso revocabit ad oscula poste?
Obvius intranti rursus quis in ora manusque
prosiliet brevibusque umeros circumdabit ulnis?
Muta domus, fateor, desolatique penates,
et situs in thalamis et maesta silentia mensis!
  Quid mirum, tanto si te pius altor honorat
funere? Tu domino requies portusque senectae,
tu modo deliciae, dulcis modo pectore cura.
Non te barbaricae versabat turbo catastae,
nec mixtus Phariis venalis mercibus infans
compositosque sales meditataque verba locutus
quaesisti lascivus erum tardeque parasti.
Hic domus, hinc ortus, dominique penatibus olim
carus uterque parens atque in tua gaudia liber,
ne quererere genus. Raptum sed protinus alvo
sustulit exsultans ac prima lucida voce
astra salutantem dominus sibi mente dicavit

amplexusque sinu tulit et genuisse putavit.
Fas mihi sanctorum venia dixisse parentum,
tuque oro, Natura, sinas, cui prima per orbem
iura hominum sancire datum: non omnia sanguis
proximus aut serie generis demissa propago
alligat; interius nova saepe adscitaque serpunt
pignora conexis. Natos genuisse necesse est,
elegisse iuvat. Tenero sic blandus Achilli
semifer Haemonium vincebat Pelea Chiron.
Nec senior Peleus natum comitatus in arma
Troica, sed claro Phoenix haerebat alumno.
Optabat longe reditus Pallantis ovantis
Euander, fidus pugnas spectabat Acoetes.
Cumque procul nitidis genitor cessaret ab astris,
fluctivagus volucrem comebat Persea Dictys.
Quid referam altricum victas pietate parentes?
Quid te post cineres deceptaque funera matris
tutius Inoo reptantem pectore, Bacche?
Iam secura patris Tuscis regnabat in undis
Ilia, portantem lassabat Romulus Accam.
Vidi ego transertos alieno in robore ramos
altius ire suis. Et te iam fecerat illi
mens animusque patrem, necdum moresve decorve:
tu tamen et vinctas etiam nunc murmure voces
vagitumque rudem fletusque infantis amabas.
Ille, velut primos exspiraturus ad austros
mollibus in pratis alte flos improbus exstat,
sic tener ante diem vultu gressuque superbo
vicerat aequales multumque reliquerat annos.
Sive catenatis curvatus membra palaestris
staret, Amyclaea conceptum matre putares;
Oebaliden illo praeceps mutaret Apollo,
Alcides pensaret Hylan: seu Graius amictu
Attica facundi decurreret orsa Menandri,
laudaret gavisa sonum crinemque decorum
pressisset rosea lasciva Thalia corona;
Maeonium sive ille senem Troiaeque labores
diceret aut casus tarde remeantis Ulixis,
ipse pater sensus, ipsi stupuere magistri.
Scilicet infausta Lachesis cunabula dextra
attigit, et gremio puerum complexa fovebat
Invidia: illa genas et adultum comere crinem,

et monstrare artes et verba infigere, quae nunc
plangimus. Herculeos annis aequare labores
coeperat adsurgens, sed adhuc infantia iuxta;
iam tamen et validi gressus mensuraque maior
cultibus et visae puero decrescere vestes,
cum tibi quas vestes, quae non gestamina mitis
festinabat erus! Brevibus constringere laenis
pectora et angusta telas artare lacerna;
enormes non ille sinus, sed semper ad annos
texta legens modo puniceo velabat amictu,
nunc herbas imitante sinu, nunc dulce rubenti
murice, nunc vivis digitos incendere gemmis
gaudebat; non turba comes, non munera cessant:
sola verecundo deerat praetexta decori.
  Haec fortuna domus. Subitas inimica levavit
Parca manus. Quo, diva, feros gravis exseris ungues?
Non te forma movet, non te lacrimabilis aetas?
Hunc nec saeva viro potuisset carpere Procne,
nec fera crudeles Colchis durasset in iras,
editus Aeolia nec si foret iste Creusa;
torvus ab hoc Athamas insanos flecteret arcus;
hunc quamquam Hectoreos cineres Troiamque perosus
turribus e Phrygiis flesset missurus Ulixes.
  Septima lux et iam frigentia lumina torpent,
iam complexa manu crinem tenet infera Iuno.
Ille tamen Parcis fragiles urgentibus annos
te vultu moriente videt linguaque cadente
murmurat; in te omnes vacui iam pectoris efflat
reliquias, solum meminit solumque vocantem
exaudit, tibique ora movet, tibi verba relinquit,
et prohibet gemitus consolaturque dolentem.
Gratum est, Fata, tamen quod non Mors lenta iacentis
exedit puerile decus, manesque subibit
integer et nullo temeratus corpora damno,
qualis erat.
            Quid ego exsequias et prodiga flammis
dona loquar maestoque ardentia funera luxu?
Quod tibi purpureo tristis rogus aggere crevit,
quod Cilicum flores, quod munera graminis Indi,
quodque Arabes Phariique Palaestinique liquores
arsuram lavere comam? Cupit omnia ferre
prodigus et totos Melior succendere census,

desertas exosus opes; sed non capit ignis
invidus, atque artae desunt in munera flammae.
Horror habet sensus: qualem te funere summo
atque rogum iuxta, Melior placidissime quondam,
extimui! Tune ille hilaris comisque videri?
Unde animi saevaeque manus et barbarus horror,
dum modo fusus humi lucem aversaris iniquam,
nunc torvus pariter vestes et pectora rumpis
dilectosque premis visus et frigida labris
oscula? Erant illic genitor materque iacentis
maesta, sed attoniti te spectavere parentes.
Quid mirum? Plebs cuncta nefas et praevia flerunt
agmina, Flaminio quae limite Mulvius agger
transvehit, immeritus flammis dum tristibus infans
traditur. Et gemitum formaque aevoque meretur:
talis in Isthmiacos prolatus ab aequore portus
naufragus imposita iacuit sub matre Palaemon;
sic et in anguiferae ludentem gramine Lernae
rescissum squamis avidus bibit ignis Ophelten.
Pone metus letique minas desiste vereri:
illum nec terno latrabit Cerberus ore,
nulla soror flammis, nulla adsurgentibus hydris
terrebit; quin ipse avidae trux navita cumbae
interius steriles ripas et adusta subibit
litora, ne puero dura ascendisse facultas.
Quid mihi gaudenti proles Cyllenia virga
nuntiat? Estne aliquid tam saevo in tempore laetum?
Noverat effigies generosique ardua Blaesi
ora puer, dum saepe domi nova serta ligantem
te videt et similes tergentem pectore ceras.
Hunc ubi Lethaei lustrantem gurgitis oras
Ausonios inter proceres seriemque Quirini
adgnovit, timide primum vestigia iungit
accessu tacito summosque lacessit amictus,
inde magis sequitur; neque enim magis ille trahentem
spernit et ignota credit de stirpe nepotum.
Mox ubi delicias et rari pignus amici
sensit et amissi puerum solacia Blaesi,
tollit humo magnaque ligat cervice diuque
ipse manu gaudens vehit et, quae munera mollis
Elysii, steriles ramos mutasque volucres
porgit et obtunso pallentes germine flores.

Nec prohibet meminisse tui, sed pectora blandus
miscet et alternum pueri partitur amorem.
Hic finis rapto. Quin tu iam vulnera sedas
et tollis mersum luctu caput? Omnia functa
aut moritura vides: obeunt noctesque diesque
astraque, nec solidis prodest sua machina terris.
Nam populus mortale genus, plebisque caducae
quis fleat interitus? Hos bella, hos aequora poscunt;
his amor exitio, furor his et saeva cupido,
ut sileam morbos; hos ora rigentia Brumae,
illos implacido letalis Sirius igni,
hos manet imbrifero pallens Autumnus hiatu.
Quicquid init ortus, finem timet. Ibimus omnes,
ibimus: immensis urnam quatit Aeacus umbris.
Ast hic quem gemimus, felix hominesque deosque
et dubios casus et caecae lubrica vitae
effugit, immunis fatis. Non ille rogavit,
non timuit meruitve mori: nos anxia plebes,
nos miseri; quibus unde dies suprema, quis aevi
exitus incertum, quibus instet fulmen ab astris,
quae nubes fatale sonet. Nil flecteris istis?
Sed flectere libens. Ades huc emissus ab atro
limine, cui soli cuncta impetrare facultas,
Glaucia! (insontes animas nec portitor arcet,
nec durae comes ille serae). Tu pectora mulce,
tu prohibe manare genas noctesque beatas
dulcibus alloquiis et vivis vultibus imple
et periisse nega, desolatamque sororem,
qui potes, et miseros perge insinuare parentes.

II

VILLA SURRENTINA POLLII FELICIS

Est inter notos Sirenum nomine muros
saxaque Tyrrhenae templis onerata Minervae
celsa Dicarchei speculatrix villa profundi,
qua Bromio dilectus ager, collesque per altos
uritur et prelis non invidet uva Falernis.
Huc me post patrii laetum quinquennia lustri,
cum stadio iam pigra quies canusque sederet

pulvis, ad Ambracias conversa gymnade frondes,
trans gentile fretum placidi facundia Polli
detulit et nitidae iuvenilis gratia Pollae,
flectere iam cupidum gressus qua limite noto
Appia longarum teritur regina viarum.
Sed iuvere morae. Placido lunata recessu
hinc atque hinc curvas perrumpunt aequora rupes.
Dat natura locum montique intervenit unum
litus et in terras scopulis pendentibus exit.
Gratia prima loci: gemina testudine fumant
balnea, et e terris occurrit dulcis amaro
nympha mari. Levis hic Phorci chorus udaque crines
Cymodoce viridisque cupit Galatea lavari.
Ante domum tumidae moderator caerulus undae
excubat, innocui custos laris; huius amico
spumant templa salo. Felicia rura tuetur
Alcides; gaudet gemino sub numine portus:
hic servat terras, hic saevis fluctibus obstat.
Mira quies pelagi: ponunt hic lassa furorem
aequora et insani spirant clementius austri;
hic praeceps minus audet hiems, nulloque tumultu
stagna modesta iacent dominique imitantia mores.
Inde per obliquas erepit porticus arces,
urbis opus, longoque domat saxa aspera dorso.
Qua prius obscuro permixti pulvere soles
et feritas inamoena viae, nunc ire voluptas:
qualis, si subeas Ephyres Baccheidos altum
culmen, ab Inoo fert semita tecta Lyaeo.
Non, mihi si cunctos Helicon indulgeat amnes
et superet Piplea sitim largeque volantis
ungula sedet equi reseretque arcana pudicos
Phemonoe fontes vel quos meus auspice Phoebo
altius immersa turbavit Pollius urna,
innumeras valeam species cultusque locorum
Pieriis aequare modis. Vix ordine longo
suffecere oculi, vix, dum per singula ducor,
suffecere gradus. Quae rerum turba! Locine
ingenium an domini mirer prius? Haec domus ortus
aspicit et Phoebi tenerum iubar; illa cadentem
detinet exactamque negat dimittere lucem,
cum iam fessa dies et in aequora montis opaci
umbra cadit vitreoque natant praetoria ponto.

Haec pelagi clamore fremunt, haec tecta sonoros
ignorant fluctus terraeque silentia malunt.
His favit natura locis, hic victa colenti
cessit et ignotos docilis mansuevit in usus.
Mons erat hic ubi plana vides; et lustra fuerunt,
quae nunc tecta subis; ubi nunc nemora ardua cernis,
hic nec terra fuit: domuit possessor, et illum
formantem rupes expugnantemque secuta
gaudet humus. Nunc cerne iugum discentia saxa
intrantesque domos iussumque recedere montem.
Iam Methymnaei vatis manus et chelys una
Thebais et Getici cedat tibi gloria plectri:
et tu saxa moves, et te nemora alta sequuntur.
  Quid referam veteres ceraeque aerisque figuras?
Si quid Apellei gaudent animasse colores,
si quid adhuc vacua tamen admirabile Pisa
Phidiacae rasere manus, quod ab arte Myronis
aut Polycliteo iussum est quod vivere caelo,
aeraque ab Isthmiacis auro potiora favillis,
ora ducum ac vatum sapientumque ora priorum,
quos tibi cura sequi, quos toto pectore sentis
expers curarum atque animum virtute quieta
compositus semperque tuus.
                                        Quid mille revolvam
culmina visendique vices? Sua cuique voluptas
atque omni proprium thalamo mare, transque iacentem
Nerea diversis servit sua terra fenestris:
haec videt Inarimen, illinc Prochyta aspera paret;
armiger hac magni patet Hectoris, inde malignum
aera respirat pelago circumflua Nesis;
inde vagis omen felix Euploea carinis,
quaeque ferit curvos exerta Megalia fluctus;
angitur et domino contra recubante proculque
Surrentina tuus spectat praetoria Limon.
Una tamen cunctis procul eminet una diaetis,
quae tibi Parthenopen derecto limite ponti
ingerit: hic Grais penitus delecta metallis
saxa; quod Eoae respergit vena Syenes,
Synnade quod maesta Phrygiae fodere secures
per Cybeles lugentis agros, ubi marmore picto
candida purpureo distinguitur area gyro;
hic et Amyclaei caesum de monte Lycurgi

quod viret et molles imitatur rupibus herbas;
hic Nomadum lucent flaventia saxa Thasosque
et Chios et gaudens fluctus superare Carystos:
omnia Chalcidicas turres obversa salutant.
Macte animo quod Graia probas, quod Graia frequentas
arva, nec invideant quae te genuere Dicarchi
moenia: nos docto melius potiemur alumno.
  Quid nunc ruris opes pontoque novalia dicam
iniecta et madidas Baccheo nectare rupes?
Saepe per autumnum iam pubescente Lyaeo
conscendit scopulos noctisque occulta sub umbra
palmite maturo rorantia lumina tersit
Nereis et dulces rapuit de collibus uvas.
Saepe et vicino sparsa est vindemia fluctu,
et Satyri cecidere vadis, nudamque per undas
Dorida montani cupierunt prendere Panes.
  Sis felix, tellus, dominis ambobus in annos
Mygdonii Pyliique senis nec nobile mutes
servitium, nec te cultu Tirynthia vincat
aula Dicarcheique sinus, nec saepius isti
blanda Therapnaei placent vineta Galaesi.
Hic ubi Pierias exercet Pollius artes,
seu volvit monitus quos dat Gargettius auctor,
seu nostram quatit ille chelyn, seu dissona nectit
carmina, sive minax ultorem stringit iambon:
hinc levis e scopulis meliora ad carmina Siren
advolat, hinc motis audit Tritonia cristis.
Tunc rabidi ponunt flatus, maria ipsa vetantur
obstrepere, emergunt pelago doctamque trahuntur
ad chelyn et blandi scopulis delphines aderrant.
  Vive, Midae gazis et Lydo ditior auro,
Troica et Euphratae supra diademata felix,
quem non ambigui fasces, non mobile vulgus,
non leges, non castra terent; qui pectore magno
spemque metumque domas voto sublimior omni,
exemptus fatis indignantemque refellens
Fortunam; dubio quem non in turbine rerum
deprendet suprema dies, sed abire paratum
ac plenum vita. Nos, vilis turba, caducis
deservire bonis semperque optare parati,
spargimur in casus: celsa tu mentis ab arce
despicis errantes humanaque gaudia rides.

Tempus erat cum te geminae suffragia terrae
diriperent, celsusque duas veherere per urbes,
inde Dicarcheis multum venerande colonis,
hinc adscite meis, pariterque his largus et illis
ac iuvenile calens plebisque errore superbus.
At nunc discussa rerum caligine verum
aspicis. Illo alii rursus iactantur in alto,
et tua securos portus placidamque quietem
intravit non quassa ratis. Sic perge, nec unquam
emeritam in nostras puppem demitte procellas.
Tuque, nurus inter longae.................... 147
.......................praecordia curae,
non frontem vertere minae, sed candida semper
gaudia et in vultu curarum ignara voluptas;
non tibi sepositas infelix strangulat arca
divitias avidique animum dispendia torquent
fenoris: expositi census et docta fruendi
temperies. Non ulla deo meliore cohaerent
pectora, non alias docuit Concordia mentes.
Discite securi, quorum de pectore mixtae 143
in longum coiere faces sanctusque pudicae
servat amicitiae leges amor. Ite per annos
saeculaque et priscae titulos praecedite famae. 146

III

ARBOR ATEDII MELIORIS

Stat, quae perspicuas nitidi Melioris opacet
arbor aquas complexa lacus; cur robore ab imo
incurvata vadis redit inde cacumine recto
ardua, ceu mediis iterum nascatur ab undis
atque habitet vitreum tacitis radicibus amnem?
Quid Phoebum tam parva rogem? Vos dicite causas,
Naides, et faciles, satis est, date carmina Fauni.
Nympharum tenerae fugiebant Pana catervae;
ille quidem it, cunctas tamquam velit, it tamen unam
in Pholoen. Silvis haec fluminibusque sequentis
nunc hirtos gressus, nunc improba cornua vitat.
Iamque et belligerum Iani nemus atraque Caci
rura Quirinalesque fuga suspensa per agros

Caelica tesca subit; ibi demum victa labore,
fessa metu, qua nunc placidi Melioris aperti
stant sine fraude lares, fluxos collegit amictus
artius et niveae posuit se margine ripae.
Insequitur velox pecorum deus et sua credit
conubia; ardenti iamiam suspiria librat
pectore, iam praedae levis imminet. Ecce citatos
advertit Diana gradus, dum per iuga septem
errat Aventinaeque legit vestigia cervae.
Paenituit vidisse deam, conversaque fidas
ad comites: 'nunquamne avidis arcebo rapinis
hoc petulans foedumque pecus, semperque pudici
decrescet mihi turba chori?' Sic deinde locuta
depromit pharetra telum breve, quod neque flexis
cornibus aut solito torquet stridore, sed una
emisit contenta manu laevumque soporem
Naidos aversa fertur tetigisse sagitta.
Illa diem pariter surgens hostemque protervum
vidit et in fontem, niveos ne panderet artus,
sic tota cum veste ruit, stagnisque sub altis
Pana sequi credens ima latus implicat alga.
  Quid faceret subito deceptus praedo? Nec altis
credere corpus aquis hirtae sibi conscius audet
pellis, et a tenero nandi rudis. Omnia questus,
immitem Bromium, stagna invida et invida tela,
primaevam visu platanum, cui longa propago
innumeraeque manus et iturus in aethera vertex,
deposuit iuxta vivamque adgessit harenam
optatisque aspergit aquis et talia mandat:
'vive diu nostri pignus memorabile voti,
arbor, et haec durae latebrosa cubilia nymphae
tu saltem declinis ama, preme frondibus undam.
Illa quidem meruit, sed ne, precor, igne superno
aestuet aut dura feriatur grandine; tantum
spargere tu laticem et foliis turbare memento.
Tunc ego teque diu recolam dominamque benignae
sedis et inlaesa tutabor utramque senecta,
ut Iovis, ut Phoebi frondes, ut discolor umbra
populus et nostrae stupeant tua germina pinus'.
Sic ait. Illa dei veteres †animata† calores
uberibus stagnis obliquo pendula trunco
incubat atque umbris scrutatur amantibus undas.

Sperat et amplexus, sed aquarum spiritus arcet
nec patitur tactus. Tandem eluctata sub auras
libratur fundo rursusque enode cacumen
ingeniosa levat, veluti descendat in imos
stirpe lacus alia. Iam nec Phoebeia Nais
odit et exclusos invitat gurgite ramos.
Haec tibi parva quidem genitali luce paramus
dona, sed ingenti forsan victura sub aevo.
Tu cuius placido posuere in pectore sedem
blandus honos hilarisque tamen cum pondere virtus,
cui nec pigra quies nec iniqua potentia nec spes
improba, sed medius per honesta et dulcia limes,
incorrupte fidem nullosque experte tumultus
et secrete palam quod digeris ordine vitam,
idem auri facilis contemptor et optimus idem
promere divitias opibusque immittere lucem;
hac longum florens animi morumque iuventa
Iliacos aequare senes, et vincere persta
quos pater Elysio, genetrix quos detulit annos:
hoc illi duras exoravere sorores,
hoc, quae te sub teste situm fugitura tacentem
ardua magnanimi virescet gloria Blaesi.

IV

PSITTACUS EIUSDEM

Psittace, dux volucrum, domini facunda voluptas,
humanae sollers imitator, psittace, linguae,
quis tua tam subito praeclusit murmura fato?
Hesternas, miserande, dapes moriturus inisti
nobiscum, et gratae carpentem munera mensae
errantemque toris mediae plus tempore noctis
vidimus. Adfatus etiam meditataque verba
reddideras. At nunc aeterna silentia Lethes
ille canorus habes. Cedat Phaethontia vulgi
fabula: non soli celebrant sua funera cygni.
At tibi quanta domus rutila testudine fulgens,
conexusque ebori virgarum argenteus ordo,
argutumque tuo stridentia limina cornu
et, querulae iam sponte, fores! Vacat ille beatus

carcer et augusti nusquam convicia tecti.
Huc doctae stipentur aves quis nobile fandi
ius Natura dedit: plangat Phoebeius ales,
auditasque memor penitus dimittere voces
sturnus et Aonio versae certamine picae,
quique refert iungens iterata vocabula perdix,
et quae Bistonio queritur soror orba cubili:
ferte simul gemitus cognataque ducite flammis
funera, et hoc cunctae miserandum addiscite carmen:
'occidit aeriae celeberrima gloria gentis
psittacus, ille plagae viridis regnator Eoae;
quem non gemmata volucris Iunonia cauda
vinceret aspectu, gelidi non Phasidis ales,
nec quas umenti Numidae rapuere sub austro;
ille salutator regum nomenque locutus
Caesareum et queruli quondam vice functus amici,
nunc conviva levis monstrataque reddere verba
tam facilis, quo tu, Melior dilecte, recluso
nunquam solus eras. At non inglorius umbris
mittitur: Assyrio cineres adolentur amomo
et tenues Arabum respirant gramine plumae
Sicaniisque crocis; senio nec fessus inerti
scandet odoratos phoenix felicior ignes'.

V

LEO MANSUETUS

Quid tibi monstrata mansuescere profuit ira?
Quid scelus humanasque animo dediscere caedes
imperiumque pati et domino parere minori?
Quid, quod abire domo rursusque in claustra reverti
suetus et a capta iam sponte recedere praeda
insertasque manus laxo dimittere morsu?
Occidis, altarum vastator docte ferarum,
non grege Massylo curvaque indagine clausus,
non formidato supra venabula saltu
incitus aut caeco foveae deceptus hiatu,
sed victus fugiente fera. Stat cardine aperto
infelix cavea et clausis circum undique portis
hoc licuisse nefas placidi tumuere leones.

Tum cunctis cecidere iubae, puduitque relatum
aspicere, et totas duxere in lumina frontes.
At non te primo fusum novus obruit ictu
ille pudor: mansere animi, virtusque cadenti
a media iam morte redit, nec protinus omnes
terga dedere minae. Sicut sibi conscius alti
vulneris adversum moriens it miles in hostem
attollitque manum et ferro labente minatur,
sic piger ille gradu solitoque exutus honore
firmat hians oculos animamque hostemque requirit.
Magna tamen subiti tecum solacia leti,
victe, feres, quod te maesti populusque patresque,
ceu notus caderes tristi gladiator harena,
ingemuere mori; magni quod Caesaris ora
inter tot Scythicas Libycasque, a litore Rheni
et Pharia de gente feras, quas perdere vile est,
unius amissi tetigit iactura leonis.

VI

CONSOLATIO AD FLAVIUM URSUM DE AMISSIONE PUERI DELICATI

Saeve nimis, lacrimis quisquis discrimina ponis
lugendique modos. Miserum est primaeva parenti
pignora surgentesque (nefas!) accendere natos;
durum et deserti praerepta coniuge partem
conclamare tori, maesta et lamenta sororum
et fratrum gemitus; alte tamen, at procul intrat
altius in sensus, maioraque vulnera vincit
plaga minor. Famulum (quia rerum nomina caeca
sic miscet Fortuna manu nec pectora novit),
sed famulum gemis, Urse, pium, sed amore fideque
has meritum lacrimas, cui maior stemmate iuncto
libertas ex mente fuit. Ne comprime fletus,
ne pudeat; rumpat frenos dolor iste †diesque†,
si tam dura placent: hominem gemis (ei mihi! Subdo
ipse faces), hominem, Urse, tuum, cui dulce volenti
servitium, cui triste nihil, qui sponte sibi ipse
imperiosus erat. Quisnam haec in funera missos
castiget luctus? Gemit inter bella peremptum

Parthus equum, fidosque canes flevere Molossi,
et volucres habuere rogum cervusque Maronem.
  Quid si nec famulus? Vidi ipse habitusque notavi
te tantum cupientis erum, sed maior in ore
spiritus et tenero manifesti in sanguine mores.
Optarent multum Graiae cuperentque Latinae
sic peperisse nurus. Non talem Cressa superbum
callida sollicito revocavit Thesea filo,
nec Paris Oebalios talis visurus amores
rusticus invitas deiecit in aequora pinus.
Non fallo aut cantus assueta licentia ducit:
vidi et adhuc video, qualem nec bella caventem
litore virgineo Thetis occultavit Achillem,
nec circum saevi fugientem moenia Phoebi
Troilon Haemoniae deprendit lancea dextrae.
Qualis eras! Procul en cunctis puerisque virisque
pulchrior et tantum domino minor! Illius unus
ante decor, quantum praecedit clara minores
luna faces quantumque alios premit Hesperos ignes.
Non tibi femineum vultu decus oraque supra
mollis honos, qualis dubiae quos crimina formae
de sexu transire iubent: torva atque virilis
gratia; nec petulans acies, blandique severo
igne oculi, qualis bellans sine casside visu
Parthenopaeus erat; simplexque horrore decoro
crinis, et obsessae nondum primoque micantes
flore genae: talem Ledaeo gurgite pubem
educat Eurotas, teneri sic integer aevi
Elin adit primosque Iovi puer approbat annos.
Non pudor ingenuae mentis tranquillaque morum
temperies teneroque animus maturior aevo
carmine †quo potasse queam†. Saepe ille volentem
castigabat erum studioque altisque iuvabat
consiliis; tecum tristisque hilarisque nec unquam
ille suus vultumque tuo sumebat ab ore:
dignus et Haemonium Pyladen praecedere fama
Cecropiamque fidem. Sed laudum terminus esto,
quem fortuna sinit: non mente fidelior aegra
speravit tardi reditus Eumaeus Ulixis.
  Quis deus aut quisnam tam tristia vulnera casus
eligit? Unde manus Fatis tam certa nocendi?
O quam divitiis censuque exutus opimo

fortior, Urse, fores! Si vel fumante ruina
ructassent dites Vesuvina incendia Locri,
seu Pollentinos mersissent flumina saltus,
seu †Lucanus ager† seu Thybridis impetus altas
in dextrum torsisset aquas, paterere serena
fronte deos; sive alma fidem messisque negasset
Cretaque Cyreneque et qua tibi cumque beato
larga redit Fortuna sinu. Sed gnara dolorum
Invidia infelix animi vitalia vidit
laedendique vias.
Vitae modo limine adultae
nectere temptabat iuvenum pulcherrimus ille
cum tribus Eleis unam trieterida lustris,
attendit torvo tristis Rhamnusia vultu,
ac primum implevitque toros oculisque nitorem
addidit ac solito sublimius ora levavit,
heu! misero letale favens: seseque videndo
torsit ab invidia mortisque amplexa iacenti
iniecit nexus carpsitque immitis adunca
ora verenda manu. Quinto vix Phosphoros ortu
rorantem sternebat equum: iam litora duri
saeva, Philete, senis durumque Acheronta videbas,
quo domini clamate sono! Non saevius atros
nigrasset planctu genetrix tibi salva lacertos,
nec pater; et certe qui vidit funera frater
erubuit vinci. Sed nec servilis adempto
ignis: odoriferos exhausit flamma Sabaeos
et Cilicum messes Phariaeque exempta volucri
cinnama et Assyrio manantes gramine sucos,
et domini fletus: hos tantum hausere favillae,
hos bibit usque rogus; nec quod tibi Setia canos
restinxit cineres, gremio nec lubricus ossa
quod vallavit onyx, miseris acceptius umbris
quam gemitus. Sed—et ipse iuvat—quid terga dolori,
Urse, damus? Quid damna foves et pectore iniquo
vulnus amas? Ubi nota reis facundia raptis?
Quid caram crucias tam saevis luctibus umbram?
Eximius licet ille animi meritusque doleri:
solvisti. Subit ille pios carpitque quietem
Elysiam clarosque illic fortasse parentes
invenit; aut illic per amoena silentia Lethes
forsan Avernales adludunt undique mixtae

Naides, obliquoque notat Proserpina vultu.
Pone, precor, questus; alium tibi Fata Phileton,
forsan et ipse dabit, moresque habitusque decoros
monstrabit gaudens similemque docebit amorem.

VII

GENETHLIACON LUCANI AD POLLAM

Lucani proprium diem frequentet
quisquis collibus Isthmiae Diones
docto pectora concitatus oestro
pendentis bibit ungulae liquorem.
Ipsi quos penes est honor canendi,
vocalis citharae repertor Arcas,
et tu Bassaridum rotator Euhan,
et Paean et Hyantiae sorores
laetae purpureas novate vittas,
crinem comite, candidamque vestem
perfundant hederae recentiores.
Docti largius evagentur amnes,
et plus Aoniae virete silvae,
et, si qua patet aut diem recepit,
sertis mollibus expleatur umbra.
Centum Thespiacis odora lucis
stent altaria victimaeque centum,
quas Dirce lavat aut alit Cithaeron.
Lucanum canimus, favete linguis;
vestra est ista dies, favete, Musae,
dum qui vos geminas tulit per artes,
et vinctae pede vocis et solutae,
Romani colitur chori sacerdos.
Felix heu nimis et beata tellus,
quae pronos Hyperionis meatus
summis Oceani vides in undis
stridoremque rotae cadentis audis;
quae Tritonide fertilis Athenas
unctis, Baetica, provocas trapetis:
Lucanum potes imputare terris!
Hoc plus quam Senecam dedisse mundo
aut dulcem generasse Gallionem.

Attollat refluos in astra fontes
Graio nobilior Melete Baetis;
Baetim, Mantua, provocare noli.
  Natum protinus atque humum per ipsam
primo murmure dulce vagientem
blando Calliope sinu recepit.
Tum primum posito remissa luctu
longos Orpheos exuit dolores
et dixit: 'puer o dicate Musis,
longaevos cito transiture vates,
non tu flumina nec greges ferarum
nec plectro Geticas movebis ornos,
sed septem iuga Martiumque Thybrim
et doctos equites et eloquente
cantu purpureum trahes senatum.
Nocturnas alii Phrygum ruinas
et tardi reducis vias Ulixis
et puppem temerariam Minervae
trita vatibus orbita sequantur:
tu carus Latio memorque gentis
carmen fortior exeres togatum.
Ac primum teneris adhuc in annis
ludes Hectora Thessalosque currus
et supplex Priami potentis aurum,
et sedes reserabis inferorum;
ingratus Nero dulcibus theatris
et noster tibi proferetur Orpheus.
Dices culminibus Remi vagantis
infandos domini nocentis ignes.
Hinc castae titulum decusque Pollae
iucunda dabis adlocutione.
Mox coepta generosior iuventa
albos ossibus Italis Philippos
et Pharsalica bella detonabis,
quo fulmen ducis inter arma divi,
libertate gravem pia Catonem
et gratum popularitate Magnum.
Tu Pelusiaci scelus Canopi
deflebis pius et Pharo cruenta
Pompeio dabis altius sepulcrum.
Haec primo iuvenis canes sub aevo,
ante annos Culicis Maroniani.

Cedet Musa rudis ferocis Enni
et docti furor arduus Lucreti,
et qui per freta duxit Argonautas,
et qui corpora prima transfigurat.
Quid? Maius loquar: ipsa te Latinis
Aeneis venerabitur canentem.
  Nec solum dabo carminum nitorem,
sed taedis genialibus dicabo
doctam atque ingenio tuo decoram
qualem blanda Venus daretque Iuno
forma, simplicitate, comitate,
censu, sanguine, gratia, decore,
et vestros hymenaeon ante postes
festis cantibus ipsa personabo.
  O saevae nimium gravesque Parcae!
O nunquam data longa fata summis!
Cur plus, ardua, casibus patetis?
Cur saeva vice magna non senescunt?
Sic natum Nasamonii Tonantis
post ortus obitusque fulminatos
angusto Babylon premit sepulcro;
sic fixum Paridis manu trementis
Pelidem Thetis horruit cadentem;
sic ripis ego murmurantis Hebri
non mutum caput Orpheos sequebar.
Sic et tu (rabidi nefas tyranni!)
iussus praecipitem subire Lethen,
dum pugnas canis arduaque voce
das solacia grandibus sepulcris,
(o dirum scelus! o scelus!) tacebis'.
  Sic fata est leviterque decidentes
abrasit lacrimas nitente plectro.
  At tu, seu rapidum poli per axem
Famae curribus arduis levatus,
qua surgunt animae potentiores,
terras despicis et sepulcra rides;
seu pacis merito nemus reclusum
felix Elysiis tenes in oris,
quo Pharsalica turba congregatur,
et te nobile carmen insonantem
Pompei comitantur et Catones
(tu magna sacer et superbus umbra

nescis Tartaron et procul nocentum
audis verbera pallidumque visa
matris lampade respicis Neronem),
adsis lucidus et vocante Polla
unum, quaeso, diem deos silentum
exores: solet hoc patere limen
ad nuptas redeuntibus maritis.
Haec te non thiasis procax dolosis
falsi numinis induit figura,
ipsum sed colit et frequentat ipsum
imis altius insitum medullis;
ac solacia vana subministrat
vultus, qui simili notatus auro
stratis praenitet incubatque somno
securae. Procul hinc abite, Mortes:
haec vitae genitalis est origo.
Cedat luctus atrox genisque manent
iam dulces lacrimae, dolorque festus,
quicquid fleverat ante, nunc adoret.

P. PAPINI STATI

SILVARUM
LIBER SECUNDUS

Commentary

PRAEFATIO

T. Janson, *Latin Prose Prefaces, Studies in Literary Conventions*. Stockholm 1964.
Z. Pavlovskis, *From Statius to Ennodius. A Brief History of Prose Prefaces to Poems*. RIL 101 (1967), 535-67 (classe di lett. e scienze mor. e stor.).
Io. Ruppert, *Quaestiones ad historiam dedicationis librorum pertinentes*. Diss. Leipzig 1911.
D. W. T. C. Vessey, *Varia Statiana*. CB 46 (1970), 49-55.
D. W. T. C. Vessey, *Statius and the Thebaid* (Cambridge 1973), 36-40.
P. White, *The Presentation and Dedication of the Silvae and the Epigrams*. JRS 64 (1974), 40-61.

The first four books of the *Silvae* are preceded by a preface in prose; the fifth book is headed by a letter which refers to the first poem of that book only. This is one of the proofs that this book was edited after Statius' death, see Vollm. 3 n. 7 and at II 1 *titulus* here.

The main purpose of these prefaces is to provide a list of contents for the books of poetry. They also serve as a comment on the circumstances under which the individual poems were composed. Thereby St. is able to formulate his literary principles and enter upon a critical discussion. Thirdly, St. uses the prefaces to dedicate his books to literary patrons and friends. See Vessey 1973, 50-1, Pavlovskis 1967, 539, Newmyer 10-1, and below.

St. and Mart. are the first extant authors who head their books of poetry with a prose preface. Their prefaces bear the character of letters: St. begins them with a conventional salutatory phrase: *Statius Stellae suo salutem* (I *Praef.*), *Statius Meliori suo salutem* (II *Praef.*) and all the other prefaces, see Mart. VIII *Praef.* 1-2, IX *Praef.* 1 *have*, XII *Praef.* 1. Some of Sts.' prefaces end with a *vale* (III *Praef.*, IV *Praef.*, not I, which is incomplete, II and V), *cf.* Mart. IX *Praef.* 5 *vale.* See also *epistola* in 4 here, Mart. I *Praef.* 17, II *Praef.* 1, 5, 8. See Janson 106 n. 2.

Though these letters are first found in St. and Mart., they stand in a tradition: on the one hand, there is the prose preface, characterized by the epistolary manner, which accompanies and introduces a prose work; on the other hand, there is the first (part of the) poem of a book which functions as a dedication and/or a program[1]. Moreover, it is probable, that lost poetical works of earlier authors than Mart. and St. were already provided with a preface in prose.

The first author to accompany his writings by a preface in the form of a letter is Archimedes. These letters are formally directed to one ad-

[1] Janson defines a preface as 'the introductory part of a long text, where the author has not yet begun to treat the main subject' (12-3). This pragmatic definition is accepted here.

dressee, but in reality to all readers of the treatises, like Sts.' letters, see Janson 19-22. Later Hellenistic scientific literature made a free use of this convention. Most aspects of Sts.' prefaces are already found in these letters: they are addressed to one person, they are written in a personal tone and the addressee is often praised (Janson 24). In Latin the first example is Hirtius' introductory letter to the 8th book of *De Bello Gallico*. The device began to gain popularity from the elder Seneca's *Controversiae* onward, see Pavlovskis 1967, 536, Janson 106, Peter 242-9.

That poetry begins with stating its theme is 'a universal convention of epic' (Vessey 1973, 60), from the Iliad onwards, and it also goes for non-epic poetry. An other characteristic of Sts.' prose prefaces, the dedication, is also a device of long standing in poetry, since the preface of Hesiod's *Erga*, see in Latin e.g. Catul. 1, Hor. *Ep.* 1, 1 ff., Phaed. III 1 and IV 1, Luc. I 33 ff., *Th.* I 17 ff., *Ach.* I 14 ff., see also II 1, 1-3n.

That Seneca and other playwrights introduced their plays with a prose letter can be concluded from Quint. *Inst.* VIII 3, 31: *memini.... inter Pomponium et Senecam etiam praefationibus esse tractatum an 'gradus eliminet' in tragoedia dici oportuisset.* This theory is supported by Mart. II *Praef.* 4-6 *video quare tragoedia atque comoedia epistolam accipiant, quibus pro se loqui non liceat.* See Fr. XXVII, Janson 111, Pavlovskis 1967, 537-8, Ruppert 23 and 42.

Vollm. supposes that Lucan introduced his *Silvae* with a prose letter, where the phrase *et quantum mihi restat ad Culicem* appeared (*cf.* II 7, 73-4n.). But this must remain uncertain. Fr. XXVIII n. 1 thinks that these words belong to a speech which Lucan delivered preliminary to a reading of the *Bellum Civile* and Pavlovskis (1967, 537 n. 11) believes that they were part of an introduction in verse.

Perhaps St. himself introduced his Thebaid with a, now lost, letter: IV *Praef.* 10 *epistola quam ad illum (Vibium Maximum) de editione Thebaidos meae publicavi*, see Janson 109, thus also Traglia-Ar. 24. But there seems to be little reason for a summary of the epic's contents in a prefatory letter, in view of the Thebaid's proem. Vollm. (14) and Fr. (XII) assume that St. refers to an unedited poem, *cf.* the *epistola ad Vitorium Marcellum* (*Silv.* IV 4).

If St. and Mart. originated the prose-letter as an introduction for poetry, it must have been Martial who invented the custom: Martial's Bk. II was probably published in 85-6 and Bk. V in 89. The first book of the *Silvae* was probably composed around 89 and not published before 92. See *SG* IV^{10} 290-6, Fr. XXIV-XXV, Pavlovskis 1967, 537-8.

After St. the prose preface reappears with his imitators Ausonius, Sidonius, Ennodius, Venantius and others, see Pavlovskis 1967,

545-67[2]. In their prefaces Sts.' influence is much more clear than Martial's.

Of the three functions of Sts.' prefaces, summary, praise and criticism, summary is the most important one, in this preface and in the others. In this respect Sts.' prefaces are rather monotonous, much more so than Martial's, see Pavlovskis 1967, 539, 542-5, Janson 110, 5-8n. here.

Of literary criticism two *topoi* appear again and again: that of swift composition, *celeritas*, see 8-13n., and that of *lusus*: St. wants his *Silvae*, so he says, to be considered as trifles. This theme is alluded to in 11 (n., *cf.* I *Praef.* 7 ff., IV *Praef.* 28 ff.).

The dedication of the book to one of Sts.' friends involves praise, often in elaborate phrases (I *Praef.* 1-2, III *Praef.* 1-2, IV *Praef.* 2, see on 1-5 here). It also throws some light on methods of publication. Sometimes St. praises his friends by trying to show that the poems are to be written on the account of the dedicatee: 4-5 and 23-4 here, III *Praef.* 25 ff., where St. says that the *ecloga ad uxorem* is really meant for Pollius, because it treats of Sts.' wish to move to Pollius' Naples, IV *Praef.* 1 ff., 16-7.

St. also asks his friends to decide whether the book which he dedicates to them may be published or not: 29-31 here, IV *Praef.* 38-40. St. draws on literary customs of his time: drafts were sent round to friends, readings were held, and only after criticism was digested publication took place, see esp. Plin. *Ep.* VII 17, 7, VIII 19, 2, also I 21, III 13, IV 4, 8, White 1974, 54-5, Guillemin 1929, 41 ff., Funaioli 437, 441-5, Sherwin White 115-6. Martial sometimes sent round selections of his poems, together with a dedicatory poem, asking for his friends' criticism (see IV 82, V 6 and 80, VII 26, XI 106, XII 1 and 4, *cf.* I 44, II 91: White 1974, 44-8, Citroni 7).

But in Sts.' case the request for criticism in the prefaces is rather a literary *topos*: a similar attitude is found in Ov. *Fast.* I 19-20, Phaed. III *prol.* 62-3, *cf.* White 1974, 53 n. 55. St. sent the separate poems of the *Silvae* to the addressees when they were freshly composed, see I *Praef.* 4 *cum singuli de sinu meo pro(diissent), congregatos ipse dimitterem...auctoritate editionis*, IV *Praef.* 31-2 *multa ex illis iam domino Caesari dederam.* When he had gathered them in a book, they had been corrected, if St. wanted to do so. He can hardly have considered seriously to draw them back from publication if Melior (for instance) advised him to do so. See Pavlovskis 1967, 542, White 1974, 50, 60-1, *General Introduction* § 3 and n. 49. Janson (108-9) takes St. more at his word.

---

[2] For a possible fragment of a prose preface in Florus, see Fr. XXVII n. 1.

The preface of the second book is of a conventional structure: in the first sentence St. praises his friend Atedius and dedicates the book to him. Then he sums up its contents (5-28). He ends by submitting the book to Atedius' critical judgment.

The style of these prefaces is not easily compared to that of the letters of Cicero, Seneca or Pliny. Cicero, except for his most serious letters, is close to the comedians in diction. Though he distinguishes different kinds of letters, his chief demand is that they must be of a light and familiar tone, *iocari*, λαλεῖν, see *Fam.* IX 21, 1, *Att.* VII 5, 5, X 2, 5, *cf.* Quint. *Inst.* VI 3, Tyrrell and Purser 59, Peter 22. Pliny aims at a more studied simplicity, *pressus sermo purusque* (VII 9, 8), which results in a somewhat artificial style, vaguely similar to Seneca's, but more moderate and, as it were, diluted, see Peter 120, Niemirska-Pliszczyńska 59, 161-2, Sherwin White 5-6[3].

In Sts.' prefaces there is nothing like Cicero's bold ellipses, or even Pliny's less audacious ones (Tyrrell and Purser 70, Niemirska-Pliszczyńska 64-73, 115-9, see on 23 below); none of their characteristic diminutives (Tyrrell and Purser 60-1, Sherwin White 6); exclamations, questions and fictional dialogue are rare in St.: I *Praef.* 15-6, 20-3, IV *Praef.* 26-7, 30-1. For their frequency in the other authors of letters, see Tyrrell and Purser 61, Niemirska-Pliszczyńska 119-32. Parataxis, a characteristic of Pliny's letters (Niemirska-Pliszczyńska 64-77), seems avoided rather than aimed at by St.; the sentences are long and involved rather than simple. It is true, a few turns remind of the epistolary style: the 4 instances quoted above, the use of *utique* in I *Praef.* 29 (see Tyrrell and Purser 69), *mehercles* in I *Praef.* 23, the end of IV *Praef.* The preface of the fourth book seems to be the only one which is vaguely similar to a 'real' letter: its sentences are shorter, the tone more vivid than in the other prefaces. Moreover it is the only preface which exhibits a mannerism dear to Pliny: it begins with a predicate, like most of Pliny's letters (and sentences in the beginning of these letters) do, see Niemirska-Pliszczyńska 73-8. But on the whole one cannot speak of an 'epistolary diction' in those prefaces, neither Cicero's nor Pliny's.

Statius Meliori suo salutem: On Atedius Melior, see II 1 *Intr.* under **III.** The phrase characterizes the preface as a letter.

1-5. Et familiaritas nostra qua gaudeo, Melior, vir optime...et ipsa opusculorum quae tibi trado condicio sic posita est ut totus hic ad te liber meus etiam sine epistola spectet: In a flowery phrase St. praises

[3] For the tone and aim of letters, see K. Thraede, *Grundzüge griechisch-römischer Brieftopik*, München 1970 (developing his thesis *Einheit-Gegenwart-Gespräch. Zur Christianisierung antiker Brieftopoi*, Bonn 1968), esp. 1-13, 27-77.

Melior, hints at his intimate relationship with such a refined gentleman and dedicates the book to him. This he does by addressing him (II 1, 1-3n.), and in the first instance (in a kind of *praeteritio*) by stating that the friendship between St. and Melior makes clear that the book is dedicated to Melior; and so do the poems themselves.

vir optime: I *Praef.* 1 *iuvenis optime.* In *Melior, optime* St. puns on Atedius' name, see II 2, 23n.

opusculorum quae tibi trado condicio: *opusculum* is used by authors to refer to (part of) their own or others' literary production, see *TLL* IX 2, 12 ff. St. employs it always for a poem by himself: IV *Praef.* 3 *aliter quam invocato numine maximi imperatoris nullum opusculum me incepisse*, 24-5 *Plotio Grypo...dignius opusculum reddam*, Hor. *Ep.* I 4, 3 (with Kiessling-Heinze) and 19, 35, see also below on *libellos.* St. employs *opusculum* in (quasi-)modesty, see below and Newmyer 46-9.

For *trado* see 20 *tradere*, I *Praef.* 21, III *Praef.* 8 *ad te mittitur.*

condicio sic posita est: their character is such, see *OLD condicio* 8 and *ponere* 12a. Out of *sic posita est* something like *talis* must be taken with *familiaritas.*

totus hic altae liber meus etiam sine epistola expectet: this is the text of M. *Expectet* is corrected into *spectet* by K, '*praeverbio, ut fit, temere addito*': Fr. *app. crit.* For *altae* σ has *alter*, which corresponds with III *Praef.* 7 *tertius hic Silvarum nostrarum liber*, IV *Praef.* 28 *in quarto Silvarum.* Vollm. conjectured *ad te* for *altae*, which is accepted by all edd., except for Clouard, who prints *alter. Ad te* is indeed necessary; for the corruption, see II 6, 6-8n. One might prefer Baehrens' *alter liber...ad te spectet*, but it is much more difficult to suppose that M or a predecessor corrupted this into *altae.* For details in the ascription of conjectures, see van Dam 379-80.

nec minus in iudicio litterarum quam in omni vitae colore tersissime: Melior is *tersissimus*, sophisticated, see II 3, 1-5n., Quint. *Inst.* XII 10, 20 *iudicium acre tersumque* and Austin: ' "pungency and nicety of taste"; *tersus* is much like *emunctus* and *limatus*'. Quint. employs it also as a term of literary criticism at X 1, 93 *tersus... Tibullus*, 94 *tersior...Horatius.* With a slight zeugma Melior is said to be sophisticated in every social situation, *vitae colore*, see Hor. *S.* II 1, 60 *quisquis erit vitae scribam color*, *Ep.* I 17, 23, Aus. *Epigr.* 5, 3 *non unus vitae color est nec carminis unus*, see *TLL* III 1721, 5-26. In short, Melior is a critic and a gentleman.

5-8. primum enim habet Glauciam nostrum: The logical subject is *liber* rather than *opusculum.* Then *primum* either means 'in the first place' (all poems aim at you because...); but this thought has no real sequel, because of the poems which are not concerned with Melior (II 2, II 5, II 6, II 7) there is only one poem which St. puts on his credit, II 6 (see 23

below). Or *primum* is *primum* (*opusculum*) *habet* (*liber*) *Glauciam* (Vollm.). This is picked up then by *sequitur* (14), *cludit* (24), see also I *Praef.* 18 *primus*, 34 *in fine*, III *Praef.* 9-10, *primum*, 12 *sequitur*, 22 *summa*, IV *Praef.* 5-8 *primo, secundo, tertio*, 11 *proximum* 21 *iunctum*. The last explanation is preferable.

St. puts the name of the boy, Glaucias, instead of 'the poem on the death of Glaucias'. For this turn, see II 7, 54-6n., 13-4 below *villa quae sequitur*, 18-20 (*leonem*) *ni traderem*, IV *Praef.* 14-6 *Vindicis nostri Herculem ... imputare etiam tibi possum, cf.* I *Praef.* 32-3 *in fine sunt kalendae Decembres*, III *Praef.* 9-10 *primum limen...Hercules Surrentinus aperit.*

cuius gratissima infantia et qualem plerumque infelices sortiuntur apud te complexus amabam iam non tibi: This is in M. Without conjecture or punctuation this is unintelligible.

St. says that Glaucias was young and charming (*gratissima infantia*), that this is often the case with those who die young (*qualem...sortiuntur*; for this thought see II 7, 90-3n.) and he mentions embracing (*complexus*).

Some editors despair: Saenger obelizes *apud...tibi* and Kl. supposes two lacunas, one following *sortiuntur* and one following *tibi*. Others accept emendations: Baehr., Postg. and Clouard read *gratissimam infantiam* (after ς), with a full stop after *amabam*. Baehr. and Clouard let the next sentence run on from *iam* to *celeritatem* and print Domitius' *vero* for *non*. Postg. makes *iam non tibi* (*est*) a separate sentence.

The easiest solution is to assume a parenthesis. Phill. puts *gratissima... sortiuntur* between brackets, with a full stop after *amabam*. Vollmer, who is followed by all the others, makes *apud te complexus amabam* a parenthesis. Vollmer's seems the best solution: Phillimore's parenthesis is unnatural and *cuius...complexus* (noun) is a harsh hyperbaton. In Vollmer's explanation the main sentence is *cuius gratissima infantia...iam non tibi* (*est*), 'whose charming infancy, of the kind that is often bestowed on the unfortunate, .. is not with you any more'. For the ellips of *est*, see on 23 below.

Phill., Fr. and Traglia-Ar. explain *complexus* as the acc. plur. of the noun, '*propter numeros*' (Fr. *app.*)[4]. This probably means that if *complexus* is a participle, the clausula would be hexametric, *cōmplēxūs ămābām*. But to take *complexus* as a noun, 'I loved Glaucias' (Fr.; or Melior's: Traglia-Ar.) embraces', seems unnatural, see *Th.* XII 337 *complexa tenerem* = *Ach.* I 253, *Silv.* II 1, 121. Conformance to the rules for the clausula in letters is not unusual in itself: Cicero does it when he does not write to correspondents despising prose rhythm (see Peter 26). Seneca is very careful in adhering to the rules (Norden 1915³, 941) and both Pliny's private

[4] Fr. states that Saenger *recte monet* this; but Saenger says that it is nom.plur.

and his public letters follow the rules for the clausula (see Norden 1915[3], 942, *LHSz.* 718, Sherwin White 6). But it is unwise to use these rules as an instrument for textual criticism here: in pre-Ciceronian authors the heroic clausula is not avoided, and Cic. himself does not condemn it (*Orat.* 217), though he avoids it in practice. Nevertheless, 0,6% of his clausulae is like the one here –⏑/⏑–– (note that the word-division in Cic. and St. is not that of the hexameter), see Kroll on Cic. *Orat.* 217. A writer like Livy does not conform at all to the rules for the clausula, see Norden 1915[3], 936-7, e.g. Liv. XXI 18, 3 *ēxtēmplō rĕpĕtūntūr.* Quint. (*Inst.* IX 4, 75) sharply condems the heroic clausula, but he also gives examples of authors employing these and other parts of verse in prose (IX 4, 72 ff.). A dactylic rhythm (though not a clausula) is commended by the author of *Peri Hypsous* (39, 4).

Moreover, some authors do write rhythmical prose (Cicero, Seneca, Quintilian, the younger Pliny), while others do not (Sallust, Livy, Columella, the elder Pliny, Tacitus), see Norden 1915[3], 939-43, *LHSz.* 718-9.

I prefer to explain *complexus* as the nom. sing. of the participle and to interpret the parenthesis as 'I loved him when I took him in my arms at your house' (Mozl.).

8-13. Huius amissi recens vulnus...epicedio prosecutus sum adeo festinanter ut excusandam habuerim affectibus tuis celeritatem: For *huius amissi...vulnus*, 'the wound which his loss is', see II 1, 1-13n., 4n., also for the theme of (too) early comfort.

epicedio: the word is first met here in Latin. It also occurs in the titles of V 1 and 3 and 5. After St. it is found in Aus. *Epic. in patr.* (title and 3), Servius on Verg. *Ecl.* 5, 14 *epicedion est quod dicitur cadavere nondum sepulto...epitaphion autem post completam sepulturam dicitur* (a distinction which is not valid for St.), *Gloss.* V 359, 22, see *TLL* V[2] 661, 72 ff., Vollm. p. 497, Fr. 53 n. 3 and for the innovation: Schamberger 239, Speranza 39-40, 42. It is one of the grecisms in Sts.' titles, like *genethliacon* (24, II 7 *tit.*), *soteria* (I 4), *eucharisticon* (IV 2), see also on II 1 *titulus.*

For the identity of *epicedion* and *consolatio* (21-2), see II 1 *Intr.*

Various other terms for a funerary poem exist: *nenia* in Pl. and others, *carmen funebre* at Quint. *Inst.* VIII 2, 8, *ferale carmen* at *CE* 1122, 1 (*cf.* Verg. *A.* IV 462 and Pease, Sil. V 223), *carmen exequiale* at Ov. *Met.* XIV 430, see *Silv.* V 3, 1 *lamentabile carmen.*

Note the abstract object with *prosequi*, to accompany (often for funerals, see *Th.* XI 614, XII 130, *OLD* 1 b), see *infantia, affectibus*, Cic. *Tusc.* V 80 *iustitiam prosecuta* (*vita*), *OLD* 4.

festinanter...celeritatem: St. often emphasizes his *celeritas* in an apologetic formula: I *Praef.* 14-7 *quam solam habuerunt gratiam celeritatis...quam timeo ne verum istuc versus quoque ipsi de se probant,* III *Praef.* 3-5 *illos...subito natos...hanc audaciam.*

Swift composition is often criticized: Catul. 22, Hor. *Ars* 386-90, see Brink on 291. When St. speaks about his *celeritas*, he contrasts it (by implication or explicitly) with the *labor limae* (see below), which belongs to epic poetry: III 2, 143 *laboratas...Thebas,* III 5, 35 ff. *longi...laboris... Thebais,* IV 4, 88-9, IV 7, 2-3 *heroos...labores,* 26 *Thebais multa cruciata lima.* St. is at pains to present his *Silvae* as trifles: I *Praef.* 1-10, IV *Praef.* 26 ff. See Fr. XXVIII ff., Aricò 48-56, Vessey 1973, 36 ff., Delarue in *Latomus* 1974, 545, II 3 *Intr.* under **I.**, II 3, 6-7n., 62-3n., II 7, 54-5n[5].

On the other hand, it is clear that St. himself is proud of his quick composition, that is to say his talent for improvisation: he tells us exactly how long it took him to compose each poem of the first book (I *Praef.* 18 ff.), see also I *Praef.* 3-4 *quadam festinandi voluptate,* III *Praef.* 10-1 *Hercules Surrentinus...quem statim ut videram his versibus adoravi,* 18-20 below. And, indeed, a talent for improvisation was highly esteemed in Sts.' time: Quint. *Inst.* X 3, 17 criticizes the habit in an often quoted passage: *eorum vitium, qui primo decurrere per materiam stilo quam velocissimo volunt et sequentes calorem atque impetum ex tempore scribunt. Hanc silvam vocant.* Though this is not aimed at St., and not even at poetry (see esp. Fr. XXXIII and Giri 452 ff., also Marastoni 1957, 396 ff., Traglia 1971, 62 ff., Delarue in Latomus 544 ff., Traglia-Ar. 21 ff., *General Intr.* n. 42), it shows the popularity of improvisation in general. For this, see esp. White 1974, 42, Guillemin 1929, 39 ff.

excusandam habuerim: 'I have had the obligation to apologize'. *Habere* with a predicative gerundive occurs since Ter. *Ph.* 365 and becomes frequent after the elder Seneca, see III *Praef.* 2 *habeo...probandam... temeritatem,* Plin. *Ep.* VIII 13, 2 *eum potissimum imitandum habes, OLD* 17a, *LHSz.* 372.

affectibus: 'your emotions' (concerning Glaucias' death), see *OLD* 1b, rather than 'your sympathy' (for me): Fr., Traglia-Ar.

affectibus is a dative: to apologize to your feelings (Mozl.). This dat. is frequent with *excusare*, see Cic. *Att.* XV 26, 5 *Varroni...memineris excusare tarditatem litterarum mearum, TLL* V 2, 1302, 23 ff. and 1303, 15 ff. St. means that he has offered his apologies to Melior, most probably in the poem itself, see II 1, 1-35, esp. 5, 8, 17 ff. He contrasts this with *nunc*: for the benefit of others he returns to the theme of his early comfort here.

[5] *'Man könnte fast sagen, dass je mehr ein Autor sich mit seiner stilistischen Unfähigkeit entschuldigt...umsomehr lässt sich stilistisches Raffinement von ihm erwarten'*: Hagendahl 134.

nec nunc eam apud te iacto, qui nosti, sed et ceteris indico, ne quis asperiore lima carmen examinet: St. does not mention his quick composition to boast of it to Melior now. This would be unnecessary, for Melior is familiar with it. But he points it out to others too, for they could, out of unfamiliarity with Sts.' negligent poetry, look too critically at it.

In *asperiore lima carmen examinet* St. mixes two metaphors: *lima* refers to filing a literary work to polish it, see above on *festinanter*, esp. IV 7, 26 there, Brink on Hor. *Ars* 291, and *OLD* under *lima* 1 b, *limatus*, Luck on Ov. *Tr.* I 7, 29 f. This image properly belongs to the activities of the author, not those of the critic. Mart. has a similar image at V 80, 13-4 where the critic is weaponed with the *lima* instead of the poet: *censoria...docti lima momordit Secundi*, also Calp. *Ecl.* 4, 52 *vis hodierna tua subigatur pagina lima*, Aus. *Lud. VII Sap.* 15-6 *correcta...vocabo, adponet docti quae mihi lima Vari*. *Asperior*, on the other hand, and *examinare* are terms for the harsh judge of literature, who weighs the work, see e.g. Gel. XVI 18, 5 *syllabarum...modus...aurium mensura examinatur, OLD* 4.

et a confuso scriptum et dolenti datum, cum paene supervacua sint tarda solacia: For the grief which *consolator* and *consolandus* share, see II 1 *Intr.*, 1-36n. For Sts.' incapability, see also II 1, 17 ff., II 1, 26-8n. For the commonplace *paene supervacua* see II 1, 1-13n.

13-5. Polli mei: On Pollius Felix, see II 2, *Intr.* under **IV.**

eloquentiae eius: See II 2, 9-12n., 113n.

amicus ignovit: Because Pollius is a friend of St., he has forgiven him his negligence. This implies that Pollius had read the poem before its publication, see *Intr.* here. For *amicus*, see *General Intr.* n. 21.

15-9. In arborem certe tuam...et psittacum scis a me leves libellos quasi epigrammatis loco scriptos: On your tree and your parrot I have certainly (as you know) written slight poems as if they were epigrams. *Leves* and *quasi epigrammatis loco* refer to the content of II 3 and II 4: unimportant, and rather a subject for an epigram. For a detailed interpretation, see II 3 *Intr.*, II 4 *Intr.*, II 5 *Intr. Certe* emphasizes this: in the other poems St. should have been more diligent, but here the subject alone is reason enough for the poems to be trifles. Vessey (1970 n. 9) sees a hit at Martial here, see II 1, 72-5n.

libellus always means 'poem' in Sts.' prefaces (I *Praef.* 3, 18, 30, III *Praef.* 3, 12, 26). In other authors it always means either 'a slender volume' or 'a book of trifles', e.g. Catul. 1 and 14, 12, Tib. III 1, 9, Phaed. IV *prol.* 15, Ov. *Tr.* I 7, 19 and 33, *Tr.* II 549 (all three, in false modesty, for the *Met.* and *Fast.*). This is the meaning *libellus* also has in *Silv.* IV 9, 1-2. See Landwehr 219-53, esp. 242 ff., Citroni 7 and 361.

leo mansuetus, quem in amphitheatro prostratum frigidum erat sacratissimo imperatori ni statim traderem: *Frigidum erat*: 'it would have been silly'. *Frigidus* is '*hebes, ineptus, stultus*' (*TLL* VI[1] 1330, 23-51). St. alludes to the technical meaning of *frigidus* in literary criticism: ψυχρόν (Ar. *Rhet.* II 3, 1), *frigidum* (Quint. *Inst.* V 10, 31), is a fault in the *inventio* or the *elocutio*, a puerile pun or a silly joke, see Lausberg §§ 1076-7. He also alludes to the literal meaning of *frigidus*: the lion did not have time to become cold before Sts.' poem was finished.

For the indicative mood in the apodosis of an unreal sentence, see *K.-St.* II 401-3, *LHSz.* 327-8.

sacratissimo: for Domitian also at III *Praef.* 13, IV *Praef.* 7, Mart. IV 30, 3, *al.* See for its meaning in the Emperor-cult Sauter 110, Scott 1936, 99.

19-23. Ad Ursum quoque nostrum...scriptam de amisso puero consolationem super ea quae ipsi debeo huic libro libenter inserui, quia honorem eius tibi laturus accepto est:

On Flavius Ursus, see II 6, *Intr.* under **II.** *Nostrum* implies that Melior also knew him.

consolatio is a more usual title than *epicedion*, see e.g. Cic. *Tusc.* I 65; 76; 115; the titles of Sen. *Dial.* VI, XI, XII, see on *epicedio* above, II 6 *titulus* n.

debeo: σ, *dehec*: M. Perhaps St. felt obliged to Ursus for an unknown reason, see II 6 *Intr.* under **I.**

quia honorem eius tibi laturus accepto: *accepto ferre alicui* means 'to credit someone for', see Tert. *Apol.* 13 *accepto ferent dei vestri*, *Gloss.* VI p. 12, col. 2 *accepto tulit*, παρεδέξατο, ἀσμένως ἤνεγκεν, ἐλογίσατο, *recepit*, *TLL* I 321, 82-322, 7. The phrase means 'because Ursus will credit you with the honour which he derives from the poem'. It is unclear why Ursus would do this. Either there is something in the relationship between St., Ursus and Melior which escapes us, or St. is hyperbolic in his attempts to credit Melior for all Sts.' poetry, see *Intr.* here, White 1974, 61, Bright 58.

For the financial vocabulary and metaphors (also *debeo, iactura* in 20, *imputari* in 26), see 23-8n.

In M this sentence and the next one one read *accepto. Excludit.* All edd., except for Baehr., Vollm., Clouard and Fr., accept Madvig's *accepto est. Cludit.* Fr. prints *accepto. Cludit.* (Baehr. and Clouard have *acceptum*: σ). He argues that the omission of *est* has nothing strange, see 5-8, II 2, 6-9n., II 6, 97-8n., II 7, 31-5n., also V *Praef.* 4, Vollm. *index* under *Ellipse*, Winter 43. Since the omission of *est* or *sit* is frequent in poetry and prose this is not an ellips characteristic of the epistolary style, see *Intr.* *Excludit* for *cludit* would be similar to *exspectet/spectet* (1-5n.). But the

combination of the omission of *est* and the addition of *ex* seems telling, and I prefer *est*.

For *inserui*, see IV *Praef.* 25-6 *hendecasyllabos...huic volumini inserui*.

iuvenem candidissimum et sine iactura desidiae doctimissimum: Ursus does not lose his free time, that is to say that when he is not working, he spends his time on culture. *Desidia* is seldom positive, but always so in St.: IV 4, 38, IV 6, 31, also Plin. *Ep.* III 3, 1 *partim studiis partim desidia fruor*, VII 14, 1, see *TLL* V^1 712, 1-5. It means *quies, otium*.

Skutsch explained *iactura desidiae* as 'without detracting from his free time (he is very learned)'. But this seems strange and *doctus* refers to liberal studies such as are practised in one's *otium*, see II 2, 119 and 152.

candidissimus: 'Most sincere', 'most kind' (rather than 'of blameless life': Mozl., Fr., Traglia-Ar.), see *TLL* III 244, 13 ff., esp. 60-80. It is used for friends or patrons who are well-disposed towards someone and/or sincere, see Hor. *Epod.* 14, 5 with Kiessling-Heinze, *S.* I 10, 86, *Ep.* I 4, 1, I 6, 68, Ov. *Tr.* I 11, 35, *Laus Pis.* 258.

23-8. cludit volumen genethliacon Lucani: *Cludere* for *claudere* rarely occurs in mss. until the younger Sen., more frequently after him, see *TLL* III 1300, 5 ff. and for St.: Mulder on *Th.* II 6.

The word *genethliacon* is not found before St., *cf.* on *epicedion* above. It is an adjective (sc. *carmen*). After St. it is found at Pan. II 3 *titulus*, Aus. *Ep.* 21 (258 *P.*) *titulus*, Serv. *Ecl. proem*, p. 23 *in genethliaco Salonini*, on *Ecl.* 4, 1, *Gloss.* V 569, 36 *genethliacus: laus natalis*. See Fr. 54 n. 6, *TLL* VI^2, 1804, 60-7. On the nature of the genethliacon, see II 7 *Intr.*, II 3 *Intr.*

Polla Argentaria, rarissima uxorum, cum hunc diem forte consuleremus, imputari sibi voluit: On Lucan's widow Polla Argentaria, see II 7 *Intr.*

For *rarissima*, see V 1, 11 *iuvenis rarissima coniunx*.

diem consulere is without a parallel: virtually the only object which occurs with *consulere* is *consilium*, but *cf.* Tert. *Idol.* 18 *supplicia consulta sunt*, Ven. Fort. VII 7, 23 *patriae qui consulit actus* and the expression *rem consulere*: *Sen. Cons. Bacch.* 6, 9, 18, Verg. *A.* XI 343-4 *rem nulli obscuram...consulis* and Servius: *rem consulis pro 'de re consulis'*. See *TLL* III 577, 46 ff. *Cum diem consuleremus* then means 'when we happened to consider (the celebration of) the day' (Mozl.).

Though this is not easy, none of the emendations proposed seems plausible enough: *consideraremus*: Domitius, *consecraremus*: Avantius, *consolaremur*: Kl., *coleremus*: Skutsch & Vollmer 826 (which gives good sense, see II 7, 23 and 126), *una coleremus*: Postg., *concelebraremus*: Saeng.

imputari sibi: 'that they were written on her account'. Polla wanted to have it known that she ordered the poem and paid for it. For honouring Lucan in this way she is mentioned as the dedicatee here.

Imputare is *acceptum ferre*, see *TLL* VII 728, 21 ff. St. employs the same financial vocabulary as in 20-4. Seneca makes sometimes use of these concepts too, e.g. *Ep.* 19, 10 and 12; 21, 7; 81 *passim.* But St. may also pun on *Argentaria*, see II 2, 21-5n., 150-3n, II 7 *Intr.* under **IV.**[6]. On the other hand, *imputare* in the sense 'to dedicate' occurs also at IV *Praef.* 16-7, Mart. III 6, 3, IV 82, 2, V 20, 13, V 80, 2, XII 82, 4, see *TLL loc. cit.*

non potui maiorem tanti auctoris habere reverentiam quam quod...hexametros meos timui: For Sts.' admiration for Lucan, see II 7, 31-5n. For the metre of II 7, see *Intr.* there under **II.** In IV 5 St. does dare to address a poem in lyric metre to the lyric poet Severus.

28-31. Haec qualiacumque sunt, Melior carissime, si tibi non displicuerint a te publicum accipiant; si minus ad me revertantur: St. makes Melior responsible for the success of the book: St. hopes that the poems will find a public out of Melior's hands, if he likes them; otherwise let him return them to St. The thought also closes the preface of Aus. *Cento*: *sin aliter...redeant versus unde venerunt*, see *Ludus VII Sap.* 17-8 *optabo, ut placeam; si minus, ut lateam*, Sid. *carm.* 3, 7 *si probat, emittit, si damnat, carmina celat.* See Fr. 54 n. 8, Pavlovskis 1967, 546, 554, White 1974, 60-1.

carissime: see I *Praef.* 23 *Stella carissime*, IV *Praef.* 1 *Marcelle carissime.*

publicum: 'public notice or cognizance' (*OLD* 6), e.g. Plin. *Ep.* VIII 3, 2 *orationi quae nuper in publicum dedi* ('published').

---

[6] Nisbet (1978), who has systematically gathered puns in St., with special interest for those on Argentaria, seems to have overlooked this passage.

II. 1. GLAUCIAS ATEDII MELIORIS DELICATUS

Consolation (general)[1]:
J. Esteve Forriol, *Die Trauer-und Trostgedichte in der römischen Literatur, untersucht nach ihrer Topik und ihrem Motivschatz*. München 1962.
R. Kassel, *Untersuchungen zur griechischen und römischen Konsolationsliteratur*. München 1958.
R. G. M. Nisbet & M. Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace's Odes Book I* (Oxford 1970), 279-89.
R. G. M. Nisbet & M. Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace's Odes Book II* (Oxford 1978), 134-51.
J. Soffel, *Die Regeln Menanders für die Leichenrede in ihrer Tradition dargestellt*. Meisenheim am Glan 1974.

Inscriptions:
D. Pikhaus, *Levensbeschouwing en milieu in de latijnse metrische inscripties. Een onderzoek naar de invloed van plaats, tijd, sociale herkomst en affectief klimaat*. Brussel 1978.
A.-M. Vérilhac, ΠΑΙΔΕΣ 'ΑΩΡΟΙ. *Poésie funéraire. T. 1 Textes*. Athinai 1978.

Statius' consolations:
R. Argenio, *Due epicedii di Papinio Stazio* (*Silv. II 1; V 5*). RSC 20 (1972), 331-62.
K. L. Baucom, *Four Consolationes of Statius*. Univ. of N. Carolina at Chapel Hill 1963[2].
O. Lottich, *Statius' Trostgedicht an den Claudius Etruscus* (*Silv. III 3*) *mit sachlichen und kritischen Erklärungen*. Hamburg 1893.
C. H. Moore, *The Epicedia of Statius*. Boston 1913[2].
C. H. Moore, *The Epicedia of Statius*. Kittredge Anniversary Papers (New York 1967), 127-37[2].
S. T. Newmyer, *The Silvae of Statius. Structure and Theme* (Leiden 1979), 19-24, 64-74.
R. Unger, *P. Papinii Statii ecloga ultima* (*V 5*). Neu-Strelitz 1868[2].

I. Death has enriched literature in many respects. One of its important legacies is Statius' consolatory poetry. Of these poems *Silv.* II 1 is the first specimen. Oratory, philosophy and poetry have moulded them. Generally speaking, oratory deals with the deceased and involves praise, while philosophy deals with the survivors and provides comfort.

The influence of oratorical practice is not great: the classic Athenian funeral oration has no room for the individual, neither for the dead nor for their survivors. It is only when the Greek funeral speech comes to life again, in the second century A.D., that we find similarities to the poetic *consolationes*: these speeches are composed by a private person and meant for publication; they mainly consist of a mixture of praise of and lament for a private person (see below). It is also improbable that the sophists' paradoxical orations, like Alcidamas' *In Praise of Death* (see Cic. *Tusc.* I

[1] The literature on ancient consolation and related themes is more than vast. Here are listed only those works from which I have profited most. Much more literature is found in the (notes on the) *Introduction*, in the commentary and in the bibliography.
[2] Not accessible to me.

116), have exercised much influence, see Kassel 9 ff., Soffel 1-22. The influence of the Roman *laudatio funebris* is probably also marginal: there is a connection with the poetic *consolatio* insofar as the *laudatio funebris* consists of lament for and praise of a private person's virtues. On the other hand, an essential difference is that the *laudatio funebris* is not at all concerned with the survivors: neither in its theory nor in the scarce remains is there any indication that it contained anything like comfort, except for very late specimens (4th century and later), which are influenced by Greek rhetorical theory. Moreover, the *laudatio funebris* was a prerogative of prominent citizens and therefore in practice generally restricted to older men. See *RE* XII 992-4 (Vollmer), Vollm. p. 317, Fr. 55 n. 3, E.-F. 115 n. 1, Kierdorf 3 ff., 54 ff., 80 ff., 116-7, 125-6, 133-6, correcting and supplementing Vollmer in most respects.

The importance of rhetoric theory is much more problematic. The first manuals for the composition of funeral orations date from the third century A.D.: Ps.-Dionysius' *Methodos Epitaphion*[3] (Usener-Radermacher II 277 ff.) and Menander's *Peri Epideiktikon* (*Rhet. Graeci* III 413-22, 434-7 *Sp.*). These contain detailed prescripts and subtle distinctions, esp. Menander. The general 19th- and early 20th-century opinion was that these manuals go back to earlier models and that St. composed his *consolationes* in accordance with their rhetorical rules[4]. However, it is rather the reverse which is true: here, as elsewhere, it is rather the poetic tradition which provides rhetoric theory with its ultimate form[5]: essential for consolatory poetry is the mingling of lament and praise. It is not yet found in Ps.-Dionysius, who may go back on a source from the 1st century, but Menander prescribes it. The stress which Menander puts on the lament also suggests that this is a new element in the theory (413, 21 ff., 419, 21 ff., 434, 18 ff. *Sp.*). Some practices are discouraged by Menander, but exercised by St., like lamenting someone who has been dead for a long time: compare *Silv.* V 1 and V 3 to Men. 419, 1. Ps.-Dion. explicitly mentions poetic *epicedia* and *threnoi* as examples (278, 8 ff.) and Menander advises taking over topics from Homer (434, 11 ff., see Soffel *ad loc.*). The rules for praising were codified to a certain extent in Statius' time and it is especially in this field

---

[3] Dated after A. Lesky, *A History of Greek Literature* (English tr. London 1966), 831. For an earlier date, see *RE* V 969.

[4] E.g. O. Schantz, *De incerti poetae ad Liviam deque carminum consolatorium apud Graecos et Romanos historia* (Diss. Marburg 1889), 69-70, F. Leo, *De Stati Silvis Commentatio.* Göttingen 1892-3, O. Ribbeck, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur III* (Stuttgart 1892), 138, Vollm. pp. 26-7, 316-7, Lohrisch *passim*, Skutsch in *RE* IV 935.

[5] Fundamental: P. Friedländer 1912, 60 ff., esp. 61, 69, 85, 102: '*Man darf nie vergessen, dass die Rhetorik...ihrerseits diese Formen aus der Poesie übernommen hat...*(the mistaken) *Glaube dass so ein Gedicht* (Silv. I 2) *versifiziertes Redesschema sei*'.

that St. and Menander share many topics; but the order and the proportion in which St. makes use of them vary, without any apparent binding rules. See Kroll in *RE Suppl.* VII 1131-2, Fr. 55 n. 3 and Moore there, E.-F. 114-7, 121-2, Newmyer 21-2, Kierdorf 58, II 1, 36-136n., 213-8n., II 2 *Intr.* under **I.**

The philosophy of grief and comfort is dominated by Crantor's *Peri Penthous*, composed *c.* 300 B.C. It canonized the rules for comforting so effectively that theoretical speculation about death and afterlife, like Plato's *Phaedo*, and other works on the subject have had only a small influence on Roman consolatory literature, see Kassel 1-40, Johann *passim.* Philosophico-psychological theory is largely lost, but philosophical consolations in prose abound: Cic. *Fam.* V 16, 17, 18, Sen. *Ep.* 63, 93, 99, the tracts *Ad Marciam, Ad Polybium, Ad Helviam matrem* and the excerpt *De remediis fortuitorum.* In Greek there is Plutarch's *Ad uxorem*, Ps.-Plut. *Ad Apollonium* and Apol. Thy. *Ep.* 58[6]. All these differ from the poetic consolations in two important respects: the deceased are not praised and there is almost no place for lamenting. The author usually appears as a stern physician, like Sen. *Ep.* 99, 2 *solacia expectas? convicia accipe.* See Kassel 14, E.-F. 125, Johann 146-7 with a scheme of *Ad Marciam.*

For Statius' *consolationes* the poetic tradition is most important by far. Lament and comfort exist in literature from Homer onwards: *Il.* XXII 421-35, XXIV 524-51, the *threnoi* of Pindar and Simonides, *cf.* Soph. *El.* 137, Eur. *Alc.* 416, *Hyps.* 757, E.-F. 114 n. 1, Nisbet-H. 1970, 280. But they have only the vaguest resemblance to the Latin poetic *consolatio.* Likewise the bucolic complaints for Adonis and Bion, *cf.* Verg. *Ecl.* 5, 20-44, fall outside our scope.

The similarities between the *consolationes* of St. and the versified sepulchral epitaphs are clearer: themes and *topoi* in St. can often be paralleled from the epitaphs and *vice versa*, see II 1, 1n., 36-136n., 40n., 47-8n., 52-4n., 56-66n., 106-9n., 110-1n., 113-9n., 120-4n., 137-57n., 153-7n., 183-234n., 191-3n., 208-26n., 208-9n., 218-9n., 226-34n., II 6 *Intr.*, 44-6n., 68-70n., 70-2n., 79-80n., II 7, 107-11n. On the other hand, they are not only very much shorter than Statius' or other poets' *consolationes*, their structure and purpose is also different: their main purpose is to honour and praise the dead one; comfort for the survivors is only secondary to this, see Pfohl 1968, 42-3, Griessmair 87-8 (the two purposes are more clearly represented in the Greek consolatory decrees in prose, see Robert 1965, 229). There is no fixed scheme or order of

---

[6] The only 'real' letters of comfort from antiquity are Sulpicius' famous letter to Cicero (*Fam.* IV 5) and *Pap. Ox.* I 115 from the 2nd century A.D.

different motifs and *topoi*, see Griessmair 93. Apart from the difficulty in dating most of the inscriptions within one or two centuries (see Pikhaus 38-9 with n. 57), it is more probable that in both the poets and the composers of epitaphs we find a representation of universal, or specifically ancient, attitudes towards death, than that the epitaphs influenced St. in considerable measure[7]. There are rarely verbal parallels in contexts where similar themes are treated, *cf.* Pikhaus 28 n. 32.

In Hellenistic times the ἐπικήδειον became a minor literary form with Euphorion and Aratus. It may well have been introduced in Rome by Parthenius, see E.-F. 4-20, Nisbet-H. 1970, 280. Of those Greek examples next to nothing is left, but we know many Latin poems of grief and comfort which belong to this tradition. Esteve Forriol has demonstrated that a number of these follow a fixed scheme: Hor. *Carm.* I 24, II 9, Verg. *A.* VI 868-86, Prop. IV 11, Ov. *Am.* II 6, III 9, the *Consolatio ad Liviam* (*Epic. Drusi*), the *Elegiae in Maecenatem, Silv.* II 1, II 6, III 3, V 1, V 3, V 5, Aus. *Epicedion in patrem*[8].

The scheme according to which these poems are constructed is as follows: **1)** *Introduction*: the poet recognizes the justice of grief and exhorts to lament or joins in it. **2)** *Laudatio*: praise of the dead. **3)** *Lamentatio*: lament for the lost one. **4)** *Descriptiones*: descriptions of illness, death and funeral. **5)** *Consolatio*: the consolation proper[9]. The order is almost invariable, but some of these main topics ('*Haupttopoi*') may be mixed, notably *laudatio* and *lamentatio* in the form *O ubi?* or *Quid profuit?* (e.g. V 1, 154, Prop. IV 11, 11-2, Ov. *Am.* II 6, 27 ff. See II 1, 36-136n., II 4 *Intr.*, 1-15n., II 6, 58-70n.)[10].

The essential difference between these poems and the prose consolations is that the poems are built upon a tension between grief and com-

---

[7] The composers of epitaphs have, to a certain extent, drawn from poetry, but reading the epitaphs in one's own surroundings, possibly anthologies of the best epitaphs and the composer's own inspiration played the greatest part, see Pikhaus 31 ff.

[8] E.-F. forms a separate group of Hor. *Carm.* I 24 and II 9, maintaining that they alone continue the tradition of Archilochus *frg.* 7 (Diehl). This seems far-fetched, but need not concern us. He also excludes a number of related poems which do not follow the scheme: Catul. 3, 68, 96, 101, Verg. *Cat.* 11, Prop. III 7, III 18, Ov. *Pont.* I 9, IV 11, *Silv.* II 4, II 5, all epigrams of Martial and all poetry of Aus. apart from the *Epic. in patr.* I do not always agree with him, notably in the exclusion of *Silv.* II 4 and 5 (see *Intr.* there).

[9] E.-F. 113-4. Other divisions differ slightly: thus Vollmer (317) leaves out *lamentatio*, splits up death and funeral, and distinguishes *Entrance into the Underworld*, which E.-F. treats under *Consolatio*. Baucom uses *exordium, laudatio, lamentatio, solacia* (Newmyer 64). Since E.-F. has the advantage of taking into account other poets than St., I adhere to his scheme and terms, though not necessarily to the way in which he has divided individual poems.

[10] Praise of the dead is mixed with lamenting that he has passed away, leaving the survivor alone and unprotected, in many cultures, see Meuli 327-31 with examples from all over the world.

fort not existing in prose: the poems start with joint grief which reaches a climax in the *lamentatio* and/or description of the funeral and disappears at the end, see 183-234n., 226-34n., II 6, 93-105n., 103-5n. See E.-F. 121: '*Das typische Merkmal der "epicedia" ist eine gedankliche Spannung die von der Trauer zum Trost führt*'[11]. One of the main reasons for this difference may be that the poems have a literary as well as a psychagogic function.

Statius' originality compared to his predecessors appears in the following ways: his poems are longer than all other consolations except for the *Epic. Drusi* (save II 4 and 5). They are written in stichic hexameters, not in elegiacs. Survivor and deceased are always personal acquaintances of St., or he writes to console himself, as he does on the death of his father (V 3) and his favourite slave (V 5). This results in an unusual wealth of personal details, often moving, see II 1, 36-136n., II 6 *Intr.* At times he endowes the poem with a symbolic function: a monument (III 3, 216, V 1, 15 = 16 *medicina* at the same time), a sacrifice (III 3, 32-3), a gift at the cremation (*ibid.* 37-8) or at the tomb (V 3, 44-6). Likewise the prayer for inspiration at the outset (V 3, 1-33, V 5, 33-6) and the pretended loss of inspiration (V 3, 3-18, 28-31, 36-7, V 5, 1-9, 24-7, 49-53, *cf.* II 1, 26, V 1, 135-6) are themes almost exclusive to St., see E.-F. 121, 129-30. Finally, St. nearly always touches upon all five '*Haupttopoi*' in his *Introduction*: the *laudatio*: II 6, 8-12, 14-7, III 3, 8 ff. (for the survivor), V 1, 1-9, 11, 31-6 (survivor), 37-42 (Domitian), V 3, 3, 26, 47-63, 89-108[12]. The *lamentatio*: II 1, 20-2, III 3, 20-1, V 1, 19-29 (esp. 22-3), V 3, 3-19, 33-5, 44, 64-79, V 5, 1-38, 59-61. The *descriptio* (usually of the funeral): II 1, 19-25, II 6, 2-3, 14-5, 20, III 3, 18-20, 22-30, 33-7, V 1, 7-9, V 3, 19-27, 31-2, 41-3, *cf.* 47-60, V 5, 8-9, 13-4, 18-21. The *consolatio*: II 1, 30-4, III 3, 1-12, 31-9, V 1, 1-4, 16, V 3, 29-31, V 3, 42-5. See E.-F. 89-90, 128-9.

St. calls II 1 an *epicedion* in II *Praef.* 8. This word occurs also in the titles of V 1, V 3 and V 5, see II *Praef.* 8-16n. On the other hand, II 6 is called a *consolatio* in II *Praef.* 21-2 and the word occurs in its title and in that of III 3, *cf.* II *Praef.* 13 *solacia*, III *Praef.* 16 *solacium*. Since there is no difference between those poems, we are forced to conclude that *epicedion* and *consolatio* mean the same thing for St.; the one in Greek and the other in Latin. Later grammatists' subtleties are vain[13], see Fr. 53 n. 3, 54 n. 2, 55 n. 3, E.-F. 112-3, Newmyer 19.

---

[11] The phenomenon is quite common in ritual grief: '*Mitweinen ist ganz allgemein, und oft ist es nur ein Vorspiel zum eigentlichen Trösten...In der Erregung des Schmerzes ist der Trauernde dem Wort unzugänglich; erst muss er sich ausgeweint...haben, und solange gibt es für den Tröster nichts anderes als Mittrauern*": Meuli 423.

[12] In V 3 St. has blurred the divisions between the main topics.

[13] In spite of Leo 1892-3, 4, G. G. Curcio, *Studio su P. Papinio Stazio* (Catania 1893), 175-6 and esp. W. Kese, *Epikedion und Consolatio in der römischen Dichtung (von Catullus bis Statius)* (Diss. Göttingen 1950, typescr.), 20-4, 124.

II. In spite of recurring thoughts and expressions, St. succeeds in making all his consolatory poems different, not least of all by his verbal mastery. II 1 is a fairly representative specimen. It is written to comfort Sts.' friend Atedius Melior for the death of his favourite, Glaucias, who had died at the age of twelve (124). For differences between II 1 and II 6, see II 6 *Intr.*

I divide the poem into: **1)** *Introduction*: 1-35. **2)** *Laudatio*: 36-136. There is no independent *lamentatio*; praise and lament are mixed: 41, 50, 52-5, 67-8, 120-5. **3)** *Descriptiones*: 137-82. Illness and death: 137-53, funeral 157-82. Lines 154-6 are intermediary and announce the consolation. **4)** *Consolatio*: 183-234. Entrance into the Underworld: 183-207, arguments for comfort: 208-34[14].

St. often has one central idea in his poems, preferably one that gives room for ambiguity and paradox (see the introductions to the other poems of this book). Here this idea results from the relationship between Melior and Glaucias: Glaucias was originally a slave, but he was set free by his master and treated like a son. St. makes a skilful use of the juxtapositions real parents/foster parents, master/slave, father/son. This juxtaposition is exemplified by the use of *alumnus* in the first line and of *parentes* in the last one. St. does not call Glaucias *verna, servus, famulus* (contrast II 6, 8, 10, 16, 21, see *Intr.* there), but *alumnus* (1) and, more often, *puer*: 37, 121, 127, 188, 192, 201, see *puerile* in 20, 155. Thus he plays on its double meaning, 'slave' and 'son' (see Nisbet-H. on Hor. *Carm.* I 19, 2, Fr. 206 n. 1: 'puer *est ambigu*', esp. Maurin). Glaucias is *pignus* in 200, *cf.* 87. The boy of II 6 is neither. Melior is sometimes *dominus* (51, 70, 76, 80) or *erus* (129), but also *pater* (103, 119) and *altor* (69). St. paraphrases the situation in three words: *dominus genuisse putavit* (80-1). At least 40% of the persons concerned in the inscriptional epitaphs are not free (see Pikhaus 105, 154, 196), but the theme is, not unexpectedly, never exploited. See also II 6 *Intr.* under **I.**

III. Martial has composed two poems on the death of the same Glaucias: VI 28, in hendecasyllables, and VI 29, in elegiac distichs. They are much shorter than *Silv.* II 1 and also much more matter of fact, note *patronus* (28, 3 and 29, 3) and *libertus* (28, 1 and 29, 4), two words which St. does not use. The similarities between St. and Mart. probably arise from the shared situation, not from imitation, see Heuvel 299-330, esp. 321-2, 72-5n. below[15].

[14] Vollmer's paraphrase (314-6) suggests roughly the same division; so does Lohrisch 29. E.-F. treats 126-36 as a digression within the *descriptio morbi*, which he lets begin at 124 (78-83), see 124-36n.

[15] Other poems by Martial with the same subject as St. are: Mart. VI 21/ *Silv.* I 2, VI 42/ *Silv.* I 5, VII 21, 22, 23/ *Silv.* II 7, VII 40/ *Silv.* III 3, IX 11, 13, 16, 17, 36/ *Silv.* III

On Atedius Melior we are informed only by St. (II *Praef.*, II 1, II 3, II 4) and Martial (also II 69, 7, IV 54, 8, VIII 38), see *PIR* I no. 1277. The *nomen* **Atedius** is known only from the titles of II 1 and II 3. Of similar *nomina* we find **Atidius** (*PIR* I 1343) and **Attidius** (*ibid.* 1341, 1342, 1344, 1345).

The question whether he was not in fact named **Aiedius** is raised by two interesting inscriptions published by Mommsen (1867): P. AIEDIUS. P. L. AMPHIO and AIEDIA. P. L. FAUSTA MELIOR. They were found in Rome and date from the first century A.D. It is tempting to assume that the titles of II 1 and II 3 wrongly read **Atedius** instead of **Aiedius** (interchange of *i/t* e.g. at I 1, 107, I 3, 63, II 2, 95, III 5, 94, see Engelmann 1902, 19). However it is improbable that MELIOR has anything to do with Atedius' cognomen; as soon as that is granted the rest of the case dwindles away[16].

From St. and Mart. we can make the following inferences about Melior: he possessed a house on the Mons Caelius (II 3, 13-5) and was well off (II 1, 128 ff., 157 ff., II 3, 70 ff., Mart. IV 54, 8, VIII 38, 11). However, he did not live in sumptuous luxury, but led a quiet life, following the middle path in everything (II 3, 15-6, 64 ff.). He was not young anymore (69-72n., II 3, 74), unmarried, had no children and his parents were dead (*ibid.*). But life had some more disappointments in store for him: he lost his dearest friend Blaesus (191-3n.), then his favourite Glaucias and finally the only thing left to him, his parrot (II 4, esp. 31-3). He is praised especially for his *pietas* towards Blaesus (II 1, 191-3n., II 3, 76-7n., Mart. VIII 38).

Other *liberti* named Glaucias are known from *CIL* VI 44 1.7, 21491, 24618, X 3790. *Liberti* named Glaucus: *CIL* V 7052, VI 18646, a slave: 19048. See *Onomasticon* under Glaucus 1 and 6A.

GLAUCIAS ATEDII MELIORIS DELICATUS: The titles of the individual poems as they have come down to us have not been given by St. himself. Regarding the 5th book this is universally recognized: one of the reasons for assuming that this book was edited after Sts.' death are the

---

4, IX 43, 44/ *Silv.* IV 7, see *SG* IV[10] 290-96, Fr. XXII-XXIII. For poems by Ausonius inspired by *Silv.* II 1, see 183n.

[16] *Cognomina* like *Melior*, which could be both *femin. gen.* and *masc. gen.* are rarely used for women (Mommsen *loc. cit.*), though *Maior* is an exception and there are a few women called *Prior* and *Minor* (I. Kajanto, *The Latin Cognomina* (Helsinki 1965), 24, 294). Secondly, double cognomina like *Fausta Melior* occur only in special cases (Mommsen *loc. cit.*, I. Kajanto, *A Study of the Greek Epitaphs of Rome* (Helsinki/Helsingfors 1963), 24-30). And thirdly there is a rule with very few exceptions that slaves and *liberti* do not take their master's *cognomen* (J. Baumgart, *Die römischen Sklavennamen* (Diss. Breslau 1936), 12-4). Summarized: that the woman's name is Fausta Melior is most improbable; that her master was named Aiedius Melior is yet more improbable.

titles of V 3 *in patrem suum* and of V 5 *in puerum suum*, see Klotz 1898, 8-9, Fr. 173 n. 1 and n. 3[17].

Vollmer argues (207-8) that the other poems received titles from St. when he edited them singly and that they kept these titles when they were collected into a book. In several cases these titles can not have been the ones which we know, as Vollm. grants: in I 1 St. could not have written *Ecus maximus Domitiani imp.* instead of *imp. Domitiani.* Similarly in IV 1 and IV 2, *imp. Aug. Germ. Dom.*, the word *imp.* is in the right place, but *Aug.* should come at the end, see Vollm. *loc. cit.* It is impossible that a title like *Psittacus eiusdem* (II 4) can belong to a poem which is separately edited; it becomes clear only because it follows on II 3 *Arbor Atedii Melioris.* Vollmer solves this difficulty by assuming that the original titles which St. gave to the poems have been altered in some cases in the course of time. He proceeds to reconstruct these original titles from the *Praefationes.* Thus the poem entitled *Balneum Claudii Etrusci* (I 5) must have been called *Balneolum Claudii Etrusci* by St., according to Vollm. (see I *Praef.* 30-1). Many names which now stand in the titles must disappear; e.g. in I 2 *Epithalamion in Stellam et Violentillam* the real title is *Epithalamion*, in II 1 it is simply *Glaucias*, in II 4 *Psittacus.* The *Consolatio ad Flavium Ursum de amissione pueri delicati* must lose the last four words, the *Hercules Surrentinus Pollii Felicis* becomes merely *Hercules Surrentinus.*

A different and much more plausible opinion was apparently last defended by Nohl in 1871 (40 ff.): Statius did not entitle his poems at all; the titles which we know stem from later grammarians. In substance I agree with Nohl, though whether St. himself entitled his poems or not must, I think, remain unsure.

In the first place, authentic titles for poetry and prose works are rare. They often vary in later catalogues and are generally represented by an *incipit*, see Nachmanson in *RLAC* IV 597 ff. (*Editionstechnik*). But even though it is occasionally known how an author called his own epic, tragedy or book of poems, no Latin poet of before the 4th century A.D. seems to have given names to his collected shorter individual poems.

The titles of Sts.' poems often smack of grammatical learning of the 3rd and 4th centuries: *Ode* (IV 5 and IV 7) is first found in Porphyrio, Marius Victorinus and Diomedes, then in Sidonius (*Ep.* IX 15, 1; see however Petr. 53, 11 *odaria*), see *TLL* IX^2 452,80-453,70, Schamberger 240. *Eucharisticon* (IV 2) recurs in Paulinus of Pella *Praef.* p. 289, 17 *eucharisticon opusculum* and as a title *Eucharisticos deo.* At the beginning of Hor. *Carm.* I 36 some mss. read *eucharistice ad Numidam Plotium...redeuntem*

[17] The title of V 1, *In Priscillam uxorem*, can be explained by the dropping out of (*Abascanti*).

ex Hispania, see *TLL* V² 1004, 77 ff., Schamberger *loc. cit. Propempticon* (III 2) is another typically technical term, see Char. *gramm.* I 124, 5 *Cinna in propemptico Pollionis*, I 134, 12, Sid. *Carm.* 24 *tit.*, see Men. 395, 4 *Sp.*: Schamberger 240. *Soteria* (I 4) occurs only once more in Latin, at Mart. XII 56, 3 *soteria poscis amicos*, gifts for recovery[18]. It seems possible, however, that later philologists gave the word a more technical meaning as a term for a *genre* of poems. Three similar titles, it is true, could have been given by St. himself, since these words occur also in the prefaces: *epicedion* (II *Praef.* 8 (see note), V 1, V 3, V 5), *genethliacon* (II *Praef.* 24 (see note), II 7) and *epithalamion* (I *Praef.* 22, I 2). Of these words *epithalamion* occurs also in Quint. *Inst.* IX 3, but *epicedion* and *genethliacon* were coined by St. All three words became very popular in later grammarians, see Schamberger 239-41. Vollmer's contention that no ancient grammarian would think of titles like *soteria* and *eucharisticon* completely fails to convince, though Schamberger and Lohrisch seem to accept Vollmer's thesis.

Another indication that others than St. have been at work is the laboriousness of the titles: the addressee is invariably mentioned in the titles (except for I 6 and II 5, which are chiefly meant for Domitian), in every case (except for I 2) with *nomen* and *cognomen.* This seems rather silly for a poem which is offered to the addressee and a bit unusual even if that poem is included in a book. The title of II 6 *consolatio ad Flavium Ursum de amissione pueri delicati* does not only impress one as odd, it is also a suspiciously close parallel of Sts.' words in his *Praef.*, see note on II 6 *tit.* (and Vollm. thinks that it is a later addition). The title of IV 9 *hendecasyllabi iocosi ad Plotium Grypum* sounds more like an explanation by someone else than as a title which an author would give.

Finally, Statius' prefaces with their sometimes tedious formulas for enumerating the contents of the book would seem to make titles for the individual poems superfluous.

It is possible that the word *delicatus* in this title and that of II 6 points to a period later than St., see below.

At one time after Sts.' death his separately published books (see Fr. XXI, Cancik 1965, n. 7) must have been brought together. This may have been the moment when book V was first edited. It seems reasonable to assume that the collection as a whole existed before the 4th century, when the *Silvae* were much read and imitated (Ausonius, Sidonius, Claudianus).

The case for the authenticity of the titles rests on one strong argument: the *nomina* of four persons are virtually only known from the titles of the

---

[18] As far as the material is contained in the *schedae* of the *TLL.*

poems: *Atedius* Melior (II 1, II 3, see II 1 *Intr.*), *Pollius* Felix (II 2, III 1), *Flavius* Ursus (II 6) and *Novius* Vindex (IV 6). The case of Pollius, whose *nomen* is attested also epigraphically (see II 2 *Intr.*), makes it very improbable that the other three *nomina* are merely the fantasy of an editor. It is, however, well possible that someone collected the five books of the *Silvae* not long after Sts.' death and possessed information about the addressees, which he used, see for similar cases Emonds 19-20, 82 ff. Alternatively, information about these four men which is lost to us may have remained accessible until long after Sts.' death. These explanations seem plausible enough to maintain that the poems did not receive their titles from St. himself.

delicatus: *delicatus* occurs both in a non-technical and a semi-technical sense and it can be both positive and negative. There is no correspondence between the technical sense and the negative one, nor between the positive and the non-technical ones. The same thing is true for the cognate word *deliciae.*

In a more strict sense *deliciae* are very young children, almost invariably slave-boys, who are bought to amuse the master or, more often, mistress of the home. The greater part of them came from Africa, esp. Egypt, and Asia, though *vernae* could also be *deliciae*, see W. J. Slater (with literature), Mau 1901, 2436. These children enjoyed a fashion in Rome in some circles and represented a combination of something like a lap-dog and a fool, see Sen. *Dial.* II 11, 3 *pueros quidem in hoc mercantur procaces...qui probra meditate effundant, nec has contumelias vocamus, sed argutias*, Quint. *Inst.* I 2, 7 *verba ne Alexandrinis quidem permittenda deliciis*, on II 1, 72-5 below, V 5, 66-8, Hdn. I 17, 3 παιδίον πάνυ νήπιον...οἷς ἀεὶ χαίρουσι Ῥωμαίων οἱ τρυφῶντες, for bought slaves or *vernae* also Suet. *Aug.* 83 (bought), Sen. *Ep.* 12, 3, Mart. V 37, 20 (*vernae*). That an attractive appearance was judged important is clear from Petronius' parody, where Trimalchio's *deliciae* is painted as an elderly squinting boy (28, 4 and 64, 5-6).

Delicati in a similar semi-technical sense are boys who were destined for giving sexual pleasure as well as serving at table, see W. J. Slater, Mau 1901, 2437-8, Kroll 1921, *TLL* V 443, 3 ff. (chaotic). *Delicati* were older than *deliciae*, from the age onwards when the first down coloured their cheeks. Our literary sources, with their predominantly moralistic tone, hardly discern between *delicati, pueri formosi, glabri, exoleti, capillati* (*criniti, comati*), see Mau *loc. cit.*, e.g. Sen. *Ep.* 47, 7; 95, 18; 119, 13-4; Mart. II 57, 5, III 58, 30, also II 6, 38-47n.

On the other hand, *deliciae* is frequently used as a general term of endearment, 'darling', from Pl. onwards (*TLL* III 445, 76 ff.). It is,

however, also used in the sense of *delicatus*, someone with whom the master has a sexual relationship, e.g. Verg. *Ecl.* 2, 2, Ov. *Tr.* II 368. There is, moreover, no reason to exclude the idea of having a sexual relationship with boys of prepubertal age, *cf.* Val. Max. VI 1, 6 *P. Atilium Philiscum in pueritia corpore quaestum a domino facere coactum.* The *pisciculi* of Tiberius and the *deliciae* of Domitianus and Commodus enjoyed free entrance to their masters' bedrooms, see Hdn. I 17, Dio XLVII 15, W. J. Slater 133-5.

In inscriptions both terms, *deliciae* (more often *delicium*) and *delicatus*, are used indiscriminately (the variation may be due to regional influences, see Mau 1901, 2437, W. J. Slater 135); the words are, of course, never negative, e.g. *CIL* XIV 2737, V 3475, *CE* 1509, see *TLL* V 443 ff. under b E, IV 450, 8-26. The differences in age between *deliciae* and *delicati* are irrelevant in inscriptions: the *delicatus* of *CIL* V 8336 is four years of age, see Slater 135.

All in all the use of these words seems largely to depend on the moral attitude of individual authors, or rather social groups, but a thorough study on the subject of these boys is still wanting (see also II 6, 38-47n.)

It is difficult to say what Sts.' use of words implies for the relationship between Glaucias and Melior. St. never employs the word *delicatus* for the simple reason that it does not fit into the hexameter. *Deliciae* occurs in 71, where St. hastily adds that Glaucias was no insolent Egyptian slave (see above), and in 200, where it is combined with *pignus* (see 200-1n.). In III 4, 57 *deliciae famulumque greges* and V 5, 67 *Pharia de puppe loquaces delicias* it seems to be used in a more specific sense. St. emphasizes the purity and chastity of the boy throughout the poem (*pudor, probitas* 40, *verecundo* 136, see 60-1n., *cf.* II 6, 48 (n.), 79), but this is not decisive in any way[19].

There is one other point: *delicatus* is virtually always a negative term and/or has sexual overtones outside inscriptions: *TLL* ranges the uses under '*infirmus, tener, pulcher*' or '*fastidiosus, elegans*', or '*luxuriosus, libidinosus, lascivus, mollis*' (V 443, 3 ff.). It implies in almost all cases an oversophistication, oversubtlety, weakness. Of the instances which *TLL* puts under '*amatus, dilectus*', there are only two which are not very late: Pl. *Rud.* 465 and Petr. 63, 3. In the last case it is both technical and perhaps unkind. It is neutral or positive in the inscriptions and Macr. II 5, 4 *duas se habere filias delicatas, rem publicam et Iuliam* and Porphyrio on Hor. *Carm.* II 9 *Valgium morte delicati pueri graviter affectum.* If the word *delicatus* is really pejorative for St. and neutral for Porphyrio, this may also indicate that the titles of the poems date from a later age.

[19] Barth, who, like all puritans, has a nose for obscene allusions (see II 6, 38-47n.), finds those in 52: '*nefario illo Amore* (*nec enim mores aetatis de hoc dubitare sinunt*)'.

1-36. INTRODUCTION: For the function of this first part, see II 1 *Intr.* under **I.** and **II.**

The *Introduction* consists of three sections, all having the same function, to catch Melior's attention and to make him responsive to comfort: in 1-13 St. implies that he can not comfort his friend because Melior is too involved in grief, in 14-25 he consents to this grief and states that he shares in it, in 26-36 he acts upon this by exhorting Melior to lament together with him, that is to listen to St. Thus in a first movement comforter and comforted come together after having been apart: *quod solamen ordiar* (1) becomes *pariter fleamus* (35); the tension between grief and comfort is provisionally resolved.

From an other point of view the *Introduction* may be bisected: it hinges on 15-7. There I and You are brought together for the first time and the poem gets under way (see n.).

Sts.' technique of touching upon all the themes of his poem may be seen here. It can be put into a wider frame: St. has a general way of hinting at themes which are important to his poem at the beginning, see Buchheit 1960, 240 n. 5, Newmyer 63-4, 73, 79-80, 89-90, 119-20 (about III 4 and V 2), II 2 *Intr.*, II 4, 2n., II 6 *Intr.*, II 7, 41-104n.

1-13.: Their central idea is represented in 8 *intempesta cano.* After the introductory rhetorical questions of 1-3, this phrase is framed by Sts.' inability to comfort Melior. First he states this directly (5-7), then in a hyperbolic, partly mythological comparison (8-12). This in its turn is framed by the mention of Melior's unbearable pain. A somewhat similar structure may be detected in II 6, 1-20 (its *Introduction*), where 8-17 form a 'central panel' framed by 1-8 and 17-20, see Newmyer 65-7 and II 7, 1-23n.

Intempesta cano represents a *topos* of the *consolatio*: it is inhuman to comfort someone when his grief is recent; therefore *improbus* (2), *saevus* (5), see *severus* 34. This had been stated by Chrysippus: Cic. *Tusc.* IV 63 *vetat...Chrysippus ad recentes quasi tumores animi remedium adhibere.* See Vollm. on 5, Kassel 7-9, Johann 36 ff., E.-F. 128 § 3 with parallels, e.g. Sen. *Dial.* XII 1, 2 *dolori tuo dum recens saeviret sciebam non occurrendum esse, ne illum ipsum solacia irritarent et accenderent*, Plin. *Ep.* V 16, 10-1 *multum faciet medii temporis spatium...ut...crudum adhuc vulnus* (see 4 here) *manus medentium* (see 5, 13) *reformidat, deinde patitur ultroque requirit, sic recens animi dolor consolationes reicit ac refugit, mox desiderat et clementer admotis* (see 13) *adquiescit.* In the *Silvae* the thought occurs also at V 1, 16-29, *cf.* V 3, 29 ff., V 5, 24.

The counterpart of this *topos* is II *Praef.* 12-3 *paene supervacua...tarda solacia*, also at Ov. *Pont.* IV 11, 17 ff., Sen. *Dial.* VI 1, 8 *corrupta* (*vulnera*)

in malum ulcus verterunt, Hier. *Ep.* 66, 1, *cf.* Cic. *Tusc.* IV 24. This *topos* is also of Stoic origin, see Vollm. on II *Praef.* 11, Johann 38 ff., E.-F. 128 § 3.

St. varies in his use of these *topoi*: he leaves them out in II 6 and III 3. In II 1 he excuses his quick reaction, in V 1 his late reaction. In V 3 and V 5 he is both comforter and aggrieved, that is to say that earlier comfort was prevented by his own pain.

The comparison of loss and wound, comforter and physician (see 4-5, 208, II *Praef.* 8, II 6, 6-8, 58, 68, 95, V 1, 16, 18, 30, V 3, 45, V 5, 39-40, 42-3) was canonized by Chrysippus, but goes back on the sophists and their appraisal of the power of words, e.g. Gorg. *Hel.* 8, comparing τοῦ λόγου δύναμις πρὸς τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς τάξιν to ἡ τῶν φαρμάκων τάξις πρὸς τὴν τῶν σωμάτων φύσιν, *cf.* Aesch. *Prom.* 379-80, Archil. *frg.* 7, 5-7, E.-F. 161 § 83.

1-3. Quod..., Melior, solamen...ordiar?: The poem begins with a question to the addressee. An essential difference between ancient and modern personal poetry is that the former is generally directed to one or more persons, while modern lyric poetry is rather a monologue in form: '*die antike Lyrik ist...mit wenigen Ausnahmen dialogisch, die moderne ganz überwiegend monologisch*' (Heinze 1960, 172 ff., 176), see also Abel 1-6 and *passim*, Cairns 1972, 178.

The person who is addressed or mentioned at the outset of the poem is its dedicatee or the dedicatee of the whole book (Catul. 1, 1, Prop. II 1, Hor. *Epod.* 1, 1, *Carm.* I 1, *Ep.* I 1, *S.* I 1 *etc.*). St. mentions someone at the beginning of his poems almost without exception. This is always the addressee of the poem. In 3 poems only the addressee is not mentioned within the first 10 lines: I 2, 17 and 25, I 5, 14 and IV 7, 32—after more than half of the poem. See also II 6, 1-2n., 10-2n. For names at the end of the poem, see 227-30n.

The question as the start of a poem is one of the ways in which the dialogic character of ancient poetry becomes apparent. The device involves the reader/hearer in the situation of the poem. Compare Pliny's anecdote of a certain Priscus, who, when a poem beginning *Prisce, iubes* was recited, was stupid enough to answer *ego vero non iubeo* (*Ep.* VI 15). Similar ways to plunge the public as it were *in medias res* are for example exclamation (often in Prop., see Boucher 375-7, also for other devices in Prop.; also Heinze 1960, 180-1), or beginning with a definite article or an indication of time (frequent in modern literature).

Opening questions become more frequent in Latin poetry after Catullus. In Tibullus they are rare; in Prop. I six out of 22 poems begin with a question, in Prop. II seven out of 43; in Hor. *Carm.* I seven out of

38, in *Carm.* III four out of 30; in Ov. *Tr.* I and III one out of 25, in *Pont.* I and II one out of 21. St. makes about as much use of it as Hor. and Prop.: 8 out of his 32 poems begin with a question: I 1, I 2, II 1, II 4, II 5, III 5, IV 3, V 4. See II 3, 35n. For the whole, see Abel 75, Promminger 7-11, Lockwood 5.

Sometimes shorter poems open with a question and end with its answer (see Schrijvers 1973, (Mnemosyne) 142-3). In the rhetorical situation of II 1 the rest of the poem may be considered as the answer which St. himself gives to his question.

1. praerepti: 'Snatched away (by death) too early', see II 6, 4, *CIL* V 5275 *inprimo aetat flore praerept.*, perhaps *Th.* II 72 (*praerepti*: Heinsius, *praerupti*: codd., see Håk. 1973, 50-1). For *rapere*, see 208-9n., for *prae-* in compounds, see II 4, 3n.

The death of children was, understandably, judged especially tragic, see Cic. *Tusc.* I 93, Men. 435, 31 *Sp.*, who commends the use of much pathos in these cases, see Soffel's note *ad loc.* More than 50% of the epitaphs in Peek's *Griechische Versinschriften* concerns so-called ἄωροι. Three, not mutually exclusive, reasons for extra grief are that the expectations which the parents cherished of their children are thwarted (e.g. Plut. *Cons. Ap.* 113 D), or simply that the joy which parents had in their child is missed (45 ff. below), or that such a death is felt as unnatural: Vérilhac no. 126, 1-2 (2nd/3rd cent. A.D.) οὐ τὸ θανεῖν ἐλύπησεν...ἀλλὰ πρὶν ἡλικίης καὶ ἥβης μέτρον ἴκεσθαι, Pikhaus 46. It is proper that parents die before their children: Cic. *N.D.* II 71, Quint. *Decl.* 335. See Griessmair 10, 47, Versnel 1980, 568-9. The overwhelming majority of the *carmina epigraphica* (esp. the pagan ones) is dedicated by parents to their children of less than 25 years, see the tables in Pikhaus 108, 156-7.

2. improbus: 'Relentless'. *Improbus* is used for everything which exceeds the bounds of the natural or decent, e.g. I 6, 54, II 1, 107, II 3, 67, see Langen on VFl. I 510, Vollmer on I 6, 54, Brinkgreve on *Ach.* I 41. Dilke (on *Ach.* I 41) distinguishes 8 categories of its central meaning 'indifference to the rights and feelings of others', but this is unsatisfactory: I 6, 54, for instance, and II 1, 107 can hardly be included under 'indifference', see also *TLL* VII 689, 18 and 693, 46. Marastoni (1958, 18) wrongly claims that in St. *improbus* always means '*ostinato*'.

improbus is explained by *adhuc vivente favilla*, which in its turn explains and surpasses *ante rogos.* The vss. 1-13 show clearly the abundance of Sts.' vocabulary. Here, and constantly in the *Silvae*, analogous things are said again and again in different terms: *solamen/ cantus/ verba medentia* (1-5), *abruptis venis/ via, vulnus/ plaga, hiat/ patet, adhuc/ etiam nunc* (2-3), *improbus/ saevus* (2-5), *planctus/ lamenta/ gemitus/ luctus/ dolorem* (6-14),

odisti/ averteris (7), *abactis fetibus/ orbati* (8-9), *carmen/ chelys* (11), *insanos/ demens* (12), *pectore/ praecordia* (12-3).

When St. says as it were the same thing twice over, there is often syntactic *variatio* (e.g. 88-102n., II 6, 25-8n.) and the second instance often surpasses the first one (*Ueberbietung* or *Uebersteigerung*, see 8-12n.). His lexical variation is one of the most important features of Sts.' style. However, St. has frequently been criticized for the poverty of his vocabulary: Vollm. 30, Härtel 25, Fr. XXIX, Marastoni 1958, 17, Traglia 1967, 173-4 (*sermo...omni careat varietate*). This is completely off the mark. Nisard referred (in 1834) to Sts.' *langue riche.* Newmyer (86) rightly states that 'exact and even close verbal echoes are rare in the *Silvae*', see also Mozley 33-4. On the richness of Sts.' vocabulary, see 128-35n., 157-82n., II 2, 21-5n., 49-51n., II 3, 1-7n., 1-5n., II 4, 1n., II 5, 11-3n., II 6, 2-6n.

rogos: Poetic plur., to avoid synaloephe with *et*: *rogos* here and in 24 = *rogus* 159, 167. On poetic plur., see Maas, Bednara, Löfstedt 1942[2] (with extensive bibliography), *LHSz.* I 16-8 (bibliography).

rogos instead of *rogum* occurs since Verg. *A.* IV 646, *rogis* instead of *rogo* since Prop. II 8, 20, see Prop. IV 7, 31, also in Verg. and Ov.: Maas 525 n. 2, Schink 113. St. has it often, in the *Silv.* at III 3, 9, 132, V 3, 83 (*rogos*), III 3, 35, 136, V 1, 7, V 2, 82 (*rogis*). The sing. occurs 6 times (of which one genitive). Schink claims that the nom. plur. is not used for one pyre, but see *Th.* IV 673-4 *cineri data mater iniquo/ natalesque rogi.*

vivente favilla: Ov. *Fast.* IV 553-4 *inque foco pueri corpus vivente favilla obruit.* See *Th.* XII 43 *an aetheriae vivant per membra favillae*, Ov. *Rem.* 731-2 *cinis...vivet, Fast.* III 427 *bene vivitis ignes.*

St. hyperbolically pretends for the moment that he is in front of the still smothering pyre (*vivente*) together with Melior. *En* (17, see n.) suggests that St. wants us to imagine this introduction as a talk to Melior (*cf.* the address in 1) and this goes for the poem as a whole, see 167, 182, 189, 207 ff. St. has tried to infuse the *Introduction* with much pathos, to kindle interest, see 17-8, 26 ff., though this does not imply that he means to be taken literally (which would be deadly esp. in the case of 26-8). Within Sts.' 'talk to Melior' things of the past are brought up with the vividness of the present, see 36-136n., 138, 146 ff. (the historic present).

3-7. ordiar: Together with *solamen* = 'to begin a *consolatio*', see Hor. *Ars* 147, Sil. I 1 *ordior arma.*

abruptis...venis...vulnus: A wound caused by tearing open the veins. St. surpasses Lucan's hyperbole (III 638-9) *nec, sicut volnere, sanguis/ emicuit lentus: ruptis cadit undique venis.* Melior is as good as dead, a first hint of 24-5, *cf.* Tacitus' use of *abrumpere venas*, to open up the veins for suicide: *Ann.* VI 29, 1, XV 59, 5, XV 63, 6, XVI 9, 2.

For the metaphor of the wound (1-13n.), see also Cic. *Fam.* V 16, 1, Sen. *Dial.* VI 1, 5; 8; 19, 1; *al.*

flebile: See 137-9n.

hiat: *Ach.* II 161 *hiantia vulnera, Th.* XII 340 *quanto descendit vulnus hiatu*, often in Celsus, *cf.* Sen. *Oed.* 190, Luc. I 624, Sil. V 257 = X 183, see *TLL* VI^3 2811, 51 ff.

magnae...via lubrica plagae: 'The great deep slippery wound', or 'the slippery gash caused by the great blow'. *Plaga* is 'wound' or 'blow causing a wound'. *Th.* IV 73 *ingentis plagarum in pectore nodos*, XII 143, 725, *Silv.* II 6, 8 rather tend towards the first interpretation, *cf.* Curt. IX 8, 20 *plagae insanabiles, OLD* 2. In that case *plagae* is a gen. explicativus. In *Th.* VIII 168 and *Silv.* II 6, 8 and V 1, 18 *vulnus* and *plaga* are combined. This first interpretation seems to be preferable. For *plaga* as 'blow (causing a wound)', see e.g. *Th.* XI 510, *OLD* 1. In that case *plagae* is a subjective gen.

hiat, via, magnae, patet all emphasize the depth and extension of Melior's wound.

plaga is far less frequent than *vulnus* in all authors, St. included. Nevertheless no poet has *plaga* as often as St.: Verg. 5, Ov. 10, Luc. 2, Sil. 0, VFl. 0, St. 11 (against over 125 instances of *vulnus* in St.).

lubrica is literal, 'slippery', rather than 'dangerous' (Mozl.), '*pitoyable*' (Fr.), see *Th.* VII 765-6 *lubrica tabo*, IX 73-4, 200 *caede lubrica*, X 846 *lubrica sanguine.*

egomet: The suffix *-met* occurs since Naevius. It is frequent in comedy, but also in post-Vergilian poetry, esp. in Manilius (16), Sen. trag. (25) and St. (24), see Fletcher 1966, 254-6, Neue-W. II 361-6, *TLL* V^2 277, 37 ff., VIII 862, 64-9. It is found about as often in the epics as in the *Silvae*, 17/7[20]. This is its only instance in *Silv.* II.

With *egomet/ tu* St. juxtaposes Melior and himself, *cf.* also *etiam nunc/ cum iam, cantus/ planctus, verba medentia/ lamentia fortia*, see 1-36n.

cantus: ἐπῳδάς, healing songs, see III 3, 41, Verg. *A.* VII 757, Sil. V 353-4, *cf.* Ov. *Met.* X 397 *carmine sanet*, II 7, 43-7n. and *verba medentia* here.

verba...consero: Thus M. The reading was defended by Rothstein 500 and Ziehen 1904, 645 and printed by Phill., Mozl., Mar., Traglia. The other edd. print *confero*, a conjecture of Domitius, defended by Merrill 85.

Conserere verba should mean 'to hold a conversation', see Serv. on Verg. *A.* IV 277 *sermo est consertio orationis et confabulatio duorum vel plurium*, Curt. VIII 12, 9 *sine interprete non poterat conseri sermo, TLL* IV 417, 2.

---

[20] *Ach.* I 647, quoted in the Concordance, has no *-met.*

What St. means is 'I address', which is *verba confero*, see *confer* in 35, *confero questus* in III 3, 42, *OLD* 3a, *TLL* IV 185, 25 (*solacia conferre* in Ps.-Quint.), IV 187, 65[21]. *Confero* and *consero* are also interchanged at *Th.* VII 260; the mistake is easy, see Fr. 1943 XXXIII, Housman on Luc. III 575 and Intr. XXXV.

lamenta...fortia mavis: *Fortia* is 'loud', see *Th.* VI 590-1 *forti pectora collidunt plausu*, Sen. *Con.* II 2, 3 *fortiora...suspiria, OLD* 3b.

For *mavis* (M²) M has *manus*, a perseveration from *planctus* or *saevus*.

chelys: Another favourite word of St. It is first found in (Ov.) *Ep. Sapph.* 181. Of poets prior to St. (in prose it is virtually non-existent, see *TLL* III 1005, 70 ff.), Seneca has it most often, 5 times. In St. it occurs 27 times. He is about the only one to prefer *chelys* to its synonym *lyra* (20 instances). Only Sil. has *chelys* 3 times and *lyra* twice. Sts.' preference for *chelys* may be connected with his attitude to Greek culture, see II 6, 24n.

surda...averteris aure: Is somewhat more unexpected than *avertis aures*, see Plin. *Pan.* 66 *oculos aures animos avertere*, esp. frequently with *oculos*, see *TLL* II 1319, 63 ff. There is no parallel for the reflexivum accompanied by an abl. in *TLL* II 1321, 17 ff.

8-12. Intempesta cano: *Intempesta* is 'unseasonable' here, ἄκαιρα, which is normally *intempestiva*. St. is the first to use *intempestum* in this sense, also at *Th.* X 79, see Speranza 1956, 46 and n. 14, *TLL* VII 2110, 83-4 (not in Schamberger).

citius...nec si: Melior does not want to listen. This is expressed by two implied comparisons: Melior is more absorbed in his grief than lions and tigers which are robbed of their offspring (8-9); even if St. were a mythological singer, he could not charm Melior into listening. The two similes, of Melior to a lion or tiger, and of St. to a mythical poet, are associated: *tigris, leones/ feris*, see 88-102n., 112-3n., 140-5n., II 6, 25-8n., 30-3n. The first one is a hyperbole, or rather *amplificatio per comparationem*, see Quint. *Inst.* VIII 4, 3 and 9: *augendo enim quod est infra necesse est extollat id quod superpositum est.* The second one is an *adynaton*.

In the *Silvae* St. seldom employs the simple comparison or simile. The only examples of these figures in the second book are II 1, 70, 106-9, 111, 179-82, II 2, 34-5, II 5, 19-23, II 6, 41-8, II 7, 93-104. His usual technique consists in setting off a thing or person by comparing it, generally favourably, to another one, often merely by implication. This happens by various formulas: *cedat* (II 2, 60-2n.), *praecedite*, or the like: II 2, 146, II 3, 72-3, II 4, 4, 9, II 6, 36, II 7, 35. Or by a (negative) comparative: II 2, 12, 125, 157, II 3, 37, II 6, 56, 82, II 7, 31-4, 53. Also *non talis*: II 6, 25-7, 30-3, *non...sed*: II 7, 43-7, 124-7 = *alii ...tu*: II 7, 48-53.

[21] Fr. (app.) quotes Grat. 74 and Gel. XV 22, 2, but these are not to the point.

For other similar devices, see II 1, 23, 112-3, 140-5, II 2, 153-4, II 6, 18-20, 24-5, 54-6.

This phenomenon fits in with Sts.' general tendency to what German scholars have called *Überbietung*. Curtius (171-4) claims that St. is the first to develop this into a mannerism (but see also II 7, 12-5n., 85-6n.). See also Lefèvre 81, Cancik 1965 n. 13, n. 73 and index under *Übersteigerung*, Friedrich 1963, 42-3, 46, 51 and Friedrich 1965 under *Manierismus*.

8-9. tigris...leones: The loving care for their young of the tigress and the lioness is described in Mela III 43, Plin. *Nat.* VIII 66, Philostr. *VA* II 14, Oppian. *Cyn.* III 360. It is because of this love that the rage of these animals when robbed of their cubs is frequently mentioned in Latin poetry, e.g. *Th.* IV 315-6, Hor. *Carm.* III 20, Verg. *G.* III 245, Ov. *Ars* II 375, Luc. V 405, VFl. VI 148, see Vollm. here, Otto 1890 *Nachträge* 19-20, *RE* XIII[1] 988, *2RE* VI 950-1.

The *tert. comp.* here is not that the animal is enraged, but that it is too involved in grief to be interested. This idea occurs only once more, it seems, at *Th.* X 820 ff. (something like it in VFl. III 737-8). For comparisons with lions and tigers in the Thebaid, see Legras 1905, 298, Kytzler 1962, 141-60, also II 5 *Intr.*, II 5, 19-23n.

orbati: Pliny (*loc. cit.*) says explicitly that the males do not care for their young and it is practically always the female which is described by the poets in these scenes where a cub is stolen. See however VFl. VI 346-7 *saeptus in arto/ dat catulos post terga leo.* Here St. uses the masc. form to stress the similarity to Melior, who is also *orbatus*. In this sense *leones* surpasses ('*überbietet*') *tigris*: the word is *masc.*, while *tigris* is nearly always a feminine form (see Neue-W. I 924), and it is a plural.

10-2. tergeminum Sicula de virgine carmen: 'The threefold song of the Sicilian maiden', the song of the three Sirens. *Tergeminum* originally means 'threefold' (e.g. Liv. VI 7 *tergeminae victoriae triplicem triumphum*); from it the use for something with three heads developed (Cerberus, Geryones *etc.*), see III 3, 27 *tergeminus custos*, Ov. *Tr.* IV 7, 16 *tergeminumque virum tergeminumque canem.* Sometimes *tergeminus* is virtually the same as *tres*: *Th.* VII 783 *tergeminosque mali custodis hiatus*, Tib. III 4, 88 *tres linguae tergeminumque caput.* It is this sense which St. stretches here, the song coming from three Siren-mouths. Or he wants us to explain the phrase as hypallage, the song coming from three Sirens. He does the same thing in III 4, 83 *nova*[22] *tergemina pectebat Gratia dextra*, see also IV 8,

[22] *Nova* is probably corrupt.

21 *ius tergeminae prolis* (= *ius trium liberorum*), *Th.* II 31 *tergemino somno* and Mulder's note.

The Sirens were often located on Sicily in literature: Strabo I 22, *al.*, Sen. *Her.O.* 189, Athen. VII 297B, Serv. on Verg. *A.* V 864, Claud. *Rapt. Pros.* III 254 *etc.*, see *2RE* III 296. St. follows this tradition also in III 3, 174.

Another tradition places them in Sorrento. St. adheres to it in II 2, 1 (see note there), III 1, 64, V 3, 82. Both traditions are found in Strabo I 22, see Fr. 55 n. 4. For Sts.' versatility in using different arguments and versions, see 1-13n. above, 52-4n., 202-5n., II 2, 32-3n., II 6, 1-13n., II 7, 128-31n.

The Sirens occur in a context similar to the one here at III 3, 174, V 3, 81 (as a topic which is too worn to use). In other *consolationes* the theme does not occur, see E.-F. § 81.

affluat: For sounds also at Cic. *Q.fr.* III 3, 1 *nihil rumoris affluxit*; for other *incorporea*, see *TLL* I 1243, 7-16.

aut: QσR, *ut*: M.

silvis chelys intellecta ferisque: The lyre which was understood by the woods and the wild beasts, the lyre of Orpheus. For *chelys* as '(song coming from) the lyre', see I 3, 99, *Th.* VIII 233 (?), Sil. XI 408 *exaudita chelys*, 451, also *Th.* X 877 *lyra.*

The thought in the background is 'you are more aggrieved than the wild beasts. Orpheus could charm *them*, but he could not have comforted you'. St. may also allude to the story of Orpheus outwitting the Sirens when the Argo safely passed their island (see Ap.Rhod. IV 842 ff.) by combining them here.

The thought 'if only I were as persuasive as Orpheus' is also found at e.g. Eur. *Alc.* 357 ff., *CE* 492, 7 f., Hor. *Carm.* I 24, 13 (see Nisbet-H. there).

St. mentions Orpheus in a similar context as here at V 1, 23, *cf.* V 3, 60. The same theme does not occur in others' *consolationes*, see E.-F. § 78[23]. For Orpheus in St., see also II 2, 60-2n., II 7, 38-41n., 98-9n.

mulceat insanos gemitus: For *mulcere* with an abstract adjunct, see III 1, 63 (*curas*), III 2, 2 (*pericula*), V 2, 58 (*imperium*), V 5, 39 (*dolores*), Verg. *A.* VII 755 (*iras*), Sil. X 615 (*questus*), *cf.* IV 2, 42 (*radios*).

insanos gemitus represents *insani* (*Amelioris*) *gemitus*. This kind of enallage, where part of someone's body or his utterance is accompanied by the adj. which rather belongs to the person himself is frequent in the *Silvae*, see e.g. 16, 45, 120, 137-9n., 141, 143, 146, 169, 172.

---

[23] Vollm. quotes Hor. *Carm.* I 24, 13 and *Epic. Drusi* 429 ff. for Orpheus in consolatory poetry, but these are both irrelevant.

insanos refers to the idea that grief is a kind of madness, which St. suggests also at V 1, 22, V 5, 23 *insania luctus, Th.* VI 203 (scholiast '*impatienter dolentes vel dolore furiatos*'), VIII 632, XII 274, see e.g. Verg. *A.* II 776. The idea is frequent in literature. It is also Stoic doctrine: grief is a disease of the soul, see Kassel 17 ff., Johann 36-9.

gemitus is not a poetic plur. (for it is also found in prose), but one which is common for words expressing an emotion (like *irae, laetitiae*). Originally probably intensifying, it is without special meaning in the language of poets, see Löfstedt 1942[2] 35, 52. Here St. may use it also to avoid *-um -um*, see *Th.* VI 107 = 527 = Verg. *A.* IX 706 = XII 713 *dat gemitum tellus*, but in *Ach.* I 68 *quos gemitus terris.*

12-3. Stat pectore...luctus: *Stat* = *fixus est, haeret*, see Verg. *A.* III 277 = VI 901 *ancora de prora iacitur, stant litore puppes*, see also II 5, 11-3n. It is used especially often for missiles which have hit someone, Ov. *Met.* V 132 *missum stetit inguine ferrum*, VIII 414, Sil. I 527, *al.* See the medical metaphors of 3-5, *mulceat* (12), *tactu* (below).

admoto latrant praecordia tactu: *Admoto tactu*, 'when I reach out to touch'. *TLL* (I 772, 66-7) explains *tactu* as a metonymy for *manu*, instancing *Ach.* I 343 *admoto non distat comere tactu*, see also V 1, 30 *ad tactus refugit cicatrix.*

It is preferable to explain *admovere* metaphorically, like Cic. *Tusc.* IV 61 *alia sit ad eum admovenda curatio*, Cels. III 2 p. 76, 1.14, Sen. *Ep.* 91, 13 *haec...solacia admoveo Liberali nostro*, Plin. *Ep.* V 16 *recens animi dolor consolationes...desiderat et clementer admotis adquiescit*, see *TLL* I 775, 65-70. St. wants 'to apply a touch' to Melior's heart = *mulcere.* See for *tactus* also Lucr. I 318, Sen. *Dial.* III 20, 3 *exulcerata et aegra corpora quae ad tactus levissimos gemunt*, II 3, 56-7n.

praecordia occurs only in the plur. Its sense here, 'heart as the seat of the affects', is more frequent than the medical sense 'the lower chest', see *OLD*, e.g. Ov. *Ep.* 12, 183 *si forte preces praecordia tangunt*, Sen. *Ep.* 74, 3 *nisi hic timor e pectore eiectus est, palpitantibus praecordiis vivitur.*

latrant: Enn. *Ann.* 584 *animus cum pectore latrat*, modelled on Hom. *Od.* XX 13 κραδίη δέ οἱ ἔνδον ὑλάκτει. *Latrare* in a transferred sense means 'to yearn for' and is transitive, with the exception of this line and Hor. *S.* II 2, 18 *latrantem stomachum* and Petr. 119, 54-5 *tabes intra membra furens curis latrantibus.* It is a high-flown word, as is shown by Horace's *bathos* and Petronius' parody. St. employs *latrare* in a non-literal sense once again, in *Th.* II 338 *magnas latrantia pectora curas* (an emulation of Petronius).

14-35.: The emphasis is throughout on the unity of Melior and Statius: *et* (17), *tecum* (19), *similis* (25), *comitem sociumque* (28), *consortia* (29), *pariter* (35). This is one argument why Melior should listen: St. feels the same

about this tragic death as Melior does. The second argument is given at the beginning of this section: St. gives Melior time to grieve first (14-7). The third argument closes the section: St. is experienced in comforting (30-4). The arguments converge in 35-6.

14-5. satiare malis...libertate doma: In those two paradoxes ('have thy fill of bitterness' and 'overcome (your grief) by giving it rein': Mozl.) St. sides against the harsh approach of Stoic psychology. He does so also in II 6, 12-3, V 5, 64. See *Intr.* here, E.-F. 126-8, Prop. II 8, 2 *et tu me lacrimas fundere, amice, vetas.* Contrast II 6, 1-20n.

In the background is the age-old thought that grief refreshes the heart, which is already found in Homer (e.g. *Il.* XXIII 10, *Od.* IV 102), *cf.* 61 here *dulces lacrimae* = *Th.* IV 782. In St. it becomes sometimes a concept of grief as pure joy: V 5, 53 *iuvat, heu, iuvat inlaudabile carmen/ fundere et incompte miserum laudare dolorem, Th.* XII 793-4, *cf.* Plin. *Ep.* VIII 16, 5 *est enim quaedam dolendi voluptas,* see *flendi voluptas* here.

15-7. iam...iamque...iamne canam?: A transitory passage. In *quod...solamen...ordiar* (1-3) and here St. acts as if he had not yet started the poem which his public is already hearing or reading. The first word which implies that St. has begun a poem is *carmine* in 18. The questions make for a difference in the situation: Melior becomes receptive and the juxtaposition of *ego/tu* becomes togetherness. Between *iamne canam* and *carmine* there occurs as it were a shift in time.

Note the emphatic repetition of *iam* (and the slight variation). See *quis* (56-8), *quod* (159-61), *non/nec* (II 6, 25-32), *ille/illic* (II 6, 97-100).

fessus: In his use of *fessus* and *lassus* St. shows that it is not easy to find rules for his use of words in epic and in the *Silvae* respectively, see Cancik *Forschungsbericht* § 2: '*Die Differenzen zwischen lyrischer und epischer Sprache sind für Statius, so weit ich weiss, noch nicht aufgearbeitet*'. See also 50-1n., 144-5n., II 2, 9-12n., II 3, 1-5n., 14-7n., 26-30n., 49-50n., 57-9n., II 5, 7n., II 6, 97-8n., 100-2n.

Fessus is much more usual in epic than *lassus* and the reverse is true for Ovid's elegies, Martial and Juvenal, see Axelson 29-30. In short, *lassus* is more vulgar. While it is true that *fessus* dominates over *lassus* in Sts.' epics, 35 (36) against 16 (17), it dominates still more strongly in the *Silvae*: 23 against 3 (I 1, 4, I 3, 14, II 2, 26). In many cases there is no difference between Sts.' diction in his epics and in his *Silvae*, see the notes quoted above; or his diction in the *Silvae* is idiosyncratic rather than vulgar. This suggests that when he thanks his father for having taught him *non vulgare loqui* (V 3, 214) he includes the *Silvae*. On the other hand, St. is always excusing himself for writing these trifles, see II *Praef. Intr.*

and 8-13n. He also admits words to the *Silvae* which he excludes more or less from the epics, see Cancik *loc. cit., General Introduction* § 4.

indignaris: Here '*fere i.q. dedignari, nolle*': *TLL* VII 1186, 47 ff., see e.g. *Th.* VI 334, IX 609, XI 741, Verg. *A.* XI 831, XII 952, Quint. *Inst.* I 3, 6.

17-8. en: The word shows '*rem praesentem vel ante oculos positam*': Hand II 367. Thence it is often used together with *cernere, aspicere* and the like, e.g. at *Th.* V 124, VII 386, Ov. *Met.* XIII 264. For all examples of *en* in St., see Fortgens on *Th.* VI 150. See also II 6, 34n. and 2n. above.

et: Equivalent to *etiam* here, see II 2, 81-2n.

mea carmina in ipso ore natant: This is in M and printed by Vollm., Kl., Phill., Mozl. The other editors print Friederich's conjecture (471) *mea carmine in ipso ora natant. Lacrimis carmina in ore natant* can only mean 'my songs are swimming in my mouth'. The translation is Merrill's (86) and it makes small sense. Friederich's conjecture is supported by V 3, 35-6 *nec lumine sicco ordior* and *Th.* II 337-8 *quotiens haec ora natare fletibus...deprendo*, see Mulder for more parallels. See also van Dam 380.

ora: the tendency to use plur. for sing. in poetry is especially strong with parts of the body. This tendency exists also in prose, possibly because parts of the body often go in pairs, see Löfstedt 1942^2 29.

The first poet to use these plurals seems to be Cicero in his *Aratea.* They do not occur in his Greek original, see Maas 533 ff., Bednara 560. Some of them become very frequent in Augustan poetry and afterwards: *ora* since Verg. *G.* III 188, very often in the *Silvae* (where *os* does not occur), *terga* since Cic. *Arat.* 152 (see *Silv.* II 5, 19, II 6, 93), *pectora* since Cic. *Arat.* 461 (see *Silv.* II 1, 27, 57, 130, 171, 206, 230, II 7, 3), *colla* since Verg. *G.* III 421 (see *Silv.* II 1, 50). For the whole, see Maas 540 ff., Bednara 560-1, Löfstedt 1942^2 47-50.

tristes...liturae: *Tristis* must be explained generally here, 'having to do with sadness', *cf.* 159, 177, II 5, 26, *aeger* II 1, 14, *maestus* 68, see Forc. 2., 3., 4.

litura: properly 'the act of crossing out', also 'a blot' or 'a lacuna', see Ov. *Tr.* I 1, 13, III 1, 15, *Ep.* 11, 1, *TLL* VII^2 1534, 50 and 1535, 35. St. uses it here in a harsh metonymy (cause-effect): tears causing blots, *cf.* Ov. *Ep.* 3, 3 *lacrimae fecere lituras.* St. emulates Ov. *Tr.* III 5, 13-4 *lacrimas...in singula verba cadentes/ore meo lacrimas.*

19-21. nigrae...pompae: Everything connected with death is black. *Ater* was the most usual term for this in pre-Augustan poetry. But in the first century *niger* takes over the symbolic value of *ater* more and more, e.g. V 1, 19 *nigra domus, Th.* VI 11, IX 851, Sil. XIII 560, Mart. XI 91, 8 *nigris...rogis.* See André 1949, 56-9, 362-3. There is also an allusion to the dark *toga* worn by the male participants, see Toynbee 1971, 46.

spectatum...Urbi scelus et puerile feretrum: *Cf.* Mart. VI 28, 2 (*Glaucias*) *tota qui cecidit Roma dolente*, see *Intr.*

That everyone is mourning is a *topos* of the *consolatio*: 175-82 (n.), V 1, 216-21, Prop. IV 11, 57, Verg. *A.* VI 872-3, *Epic. Drusi* 181-204, *cf.* II 5, 24-7 (n.), Men. 436, 11 *Sp.* τὴν σύνοδον τῆς πόλεως. The theme serves to introduce more pathos: the whole town mourns for one small boy. This is also a kind of comfort, esp. in II 5, 24-7. The theme of the gods mourning at the funeral serves the same purpose, see III 3, 131-4, Ov. *Am.* III 9, 3 ff., 45-6, *Epic. Drusi* 221-52, E.-F. 147 §§ 47 and 49.

scelus et...feretrum is a hendiadys, the bier testifying to the dreadful event. For the sense of *scelus*, something horrible, see Mart. VII 14, 1 *accidit infandum nostrae scelus...puellae.* But the word *scelus* also alludes to the *topos* 'reproaches to the gods', see 120-4n.

feretrum: Var. *L.* V 166 *ubi lectus mortui fertur dicebant feretrum nostri.* See *Th.* VI 55 *puerile feretrum.*

produxi: *Producere* is a standard term for conducting a corpse to the grave or the pyre, see *OLD* 6c, Mulder on *Th.* II 313.

produxi...vidi(22)...tenui(25) indicate different stages in the funeral, with increasing participation of St. Therefore commas after *produxi* and *vidi* (Kl., Mozl., Fr., Sb.) are to be preferred over semi-colons (Phill., Mar.) or combinations with a colon (the other editors).

21-2. damnati turis acervos: *Damnatus* is said of things devoted to something unpleasant also at *Th.* VI 54-6 *tristibus interea ramis teneraque cupresso/ damnatus flammae torus et puerile feretrum/ texitur*, VII 239 (*campus*) *damnatus bellis.* Here it is 'devoted to the Underworld', *cf.* V 1, 136 *comam damnare cupresso* (abl.), Mart. XII 48, 7 *infelix damnatae sphongea virgae.*

M has *damnat, damnati* is in γRB^r.

turis acervos also ends the verse in *Th.* XI 222, Ov. *Met.* V 131, *al.*, see Venini on *Th.* XI 222.

For the use of spices at the cremation, see 159-62n.

plorantem...animam supra sua funera vidi: 'I saw the soul wailing above its own corpse'. The soul of the dead one is often depicted in poetry and plastic art (e.g. Attic lekuthoi). For literature and parallels, see Vollm., esp. *Th.* XII 285 *animas sua membra gementes.* The most extensive explication of the verse is found in Gevaertius' commentary (from 1616), the first one to understand it correctly was Behotius in 1602 (*caput* 13). Scaliger's *ploratam* is unnecessary.

For *funera*, corpse, see *Th.* I 37, 77, II 461, 571, *etc.*, Prop. I 17, 8, Verg. *A.* IX 491, *al.*, *OLD* 2a, *TLL* VI^1 1605, 36 ff. See also 157-8n.

The poetic plur. occurs since Enn. *var.* 17, in analogy to ταφαί, *exsequiae.* In St. it is in the plur. in the sense of 'corpse' in 158, II 4, 23, III 3, 132, *Th.* IX 365, 392, 539, 646, XI 127, 645, XII 266. See Bednara 557.

vidi: 'the appeal to experience is a familiar rhetorical device': Nisbet-H. on Hor. *Carm.* I 2, 13, instancing Enn. *scen.* 97, Cic. *poet. frg.* 11, 15 *T.*, Prop. IV 2, 53, Hor. *Carm.* III 5, 21, Verg. *G.* I 471-2, *A.* II 498 ff., (Sen.) *Oct.* 231-2.

The main function of the device in St. is to claim more verisimilitude for his contentions: I 2, 85, 87, II 1, 101, II 6, 21, 30, IV 3, 145, V 2, 113, V 3, 262-3. Thence it also suggests and characterizes the didactic attitude: Tib. I 4, 33-4 with Smith's note, Prop. IV 5, 59, Verg. *G.* I 193, 197, 318, Ov. *Ars* III 487, *Tr.* III 5, 11. It is also a way of recalling the past: II 6, 30, V 1, 183-4. It creates, moreover, a kind of identification and a feeling of shared emotions: here, at II 4, 7, III 3, 176 and in V 1. This is more or less equivalent to the remark of Servius auctus on Verg. *A.* II 498 ff. that it adds pathos.

23-5. patrum gemitus superantem et bracchia matrum: The theme already touched upon in 8-9 is hinted at again: 'you could not have been more moved if you had been the boy's father'. It is fully developed in 82-105 as 'closer ties than kinship do exist'. For the same theme, see 173-4, II 6, 6 ff., 82 ff., V 5, 22.

bracchia: the activity of the arms in lamentation, *cf.* 171 *rumpis*, II 6, 82-3, III 3, 8, 176-7 *heu quantis lassantem bracchia vidi/ planctibus*, V 1, 20, V 5, 16-7, 44-5.

For the abstract object with *superare*, see V 3, 51 (*dona*); *vincere* in this sense is often found with an abstract object, e.g. at III 5, 67, V 1, 21 (*planctus*).

complexumque rogos ignemque haurire parantem: St. generally mentions that the survivor hates life (162-5n., 169-72n.) or wants to commit suicide, see Vollm., E.-F. 145 § 45. It is only missing in II 6, see *Intr.* there, and in V 5, which is incomplete. Suicide by throwing oneself into the flames occurs here, in III 3, 178-9 *vix famuli comitesque tenent*, V 3, 67-8 *turbamque tenentem vincit*, *Th.* VI 203. Suicide mentioned independent of the cremation: V 1, 199-200, 205-8 (for the dead one is not cremated but embalmed), *Th.* IX 76-7, XI 628-9, *Epic. Drusi* 417-26, Ov. *Ep.* 9, 145-8; 13, 163-4, *Tr.* I 2, 41-4, Luc. III 746, V 773-5, IX 72, Tac. *Ann.* XVI 11, Plin. *Nat.* VII 122, *al.*

Suicide as the expression or effect of grief at someone's death is known in many cultures (including our own), see Meuli 339 ff., 347-8, 927, 930, Versnel 1980, 568-9. In a grotto in Sardinia 16 epigrams on a lady who committed such a suicide were found (Versnel 1980 with n. 140). The theme is extremely rare in Greek epitaphs on dead children, see Vérilhac no. 58 ὡς ὤφελον αὐτὸς ὀλέσθαι ('*le seul exemple d'un tel regret*').

complexumque rogos: = III 3, 9, *cf.* V 5, 55 *busta Lini complexus Apollo.*

haurire is literal here, 'to swallow the flames' (Mozl.). Elsewhere in this context it rather means 'to drink in with the mind or senses': *Th.* X 596, *Silv.* V 3, 32 (where Vollm. is wrong), Verg. *A.* IV 661 (with Pease). A literal interpretation here is supported by *parantem* and line 25.

It seems possible that St. by the choice of his words wants to allude to the idea of suicide and that of love at the same time: *complexum* (see 81, 121, II *Praef.* 7) — but not the boy, only the pyre. *Haurire ignem* is often used for 'to fall in love', see Ov. *Met.* VIII 325 *flammas hausit,* X 252-3 *haurit pectore ignis,* Luc. X 71-2, see also *Ach.* I 304 *haustus amor* and *ignis* = love in V 1, 56.

vix tenui similis comes offendique tenendo: A line full of paradox: 'I restrained you, but with difficulty; in fact, I had the same wish as you. For I am your friend. So I both want to share your fate and to keep you here. As a result of this I offended you by restraining you'. See also III 3, 40 *similis gemui proiectus ad ignem.*

26-8. Et nunc...lyra: St. states, in symbolic language, that it is not Apollo who inspires him now and that his song is a dirge.

The idea that the recent loss has robbed the poet of his inspiration occurs frequently: V 3, 3-7, 14-5, 29-31, V 5, 1-9, Catul. 65, 3-4, *cf.* V 3, 10-3, 15-8, V 5, 36-7, E.-F. 129 § 8A and B. This is sometimes expressed as the loss of Apollonian or Dionysiac *insignia*: V 3, 7-9, V 5, 28-31, *cf.* V 1, 135-6, I 2, 248-50, I 5, 13-4, II 7, 9-11, E.-F. 139 § 8C.

vittis: The *vitta* (or *infula*) was worn as a sign of devotion, not only by people or animals about to be sacrificed, but also by priests: Verg. *A.* II 221 (first instance of the word, see Austin), 430, III 81, X 538, Luc. I 597, *Silv.* II 7, 9, IV 3, 116, *Th.* II 738, III 467, *al.* Thence it is also worn by the poet, the priest of Apollo: *Ach.* I 11, *Silv.* IV 4, 92, *cf.* IV 6, 98, V 3, 7-8, V 5, 29. See *RE* IX 1543, *RE Suppl.* V 172, *Kleine Pauly* II 1409, Latte 385, Mulder on *Th.* II 100.

heu: Always expresses sadness and grief. It is extremely rare in prose, but abounds in poetry, esp. in VFl. and St., who has it 67 times, 13 in the *Silvae.* In VFl. 36, Luc. 14, Sil. 54, which would mean 94, 25, 64 respectively, if they had written the same amount as St. As one would expect, most of the instances of the *Silvae* are in the *epicedia* (II 1, 50, II 6, 76, II 7, 24, III 3, 176, V 1, 165, V 3, 217, V 5, 33, 62). See *TLL* VI[3] 2671, 80 ff., F. Rohde 35 and tables. *Cf.* II 6, 14-5n.

For *at nunc heu* beginning the verse: *Th.* XII 80, *cf. Silv.* V 4, 14.

frontis honore: The laurel, *cf.* V 3, 7-9 *fugere...Parnasia...vellera... arescere laurum,* V 5, 28-9 *nec...laurus,/ nec fronti vittatus honos.* For the use of *honos,* 'a thing lending distinction': *Th.* II 100 with Mulder's note, 53 below.

Vollmer is the only editor to print Bernaert's conjecture *frondis* (ascribing it to Cruceus). This is unnecessary: *Th.* X 254-6 (*Phoebea insignia*) *frondes...honorem frontis*, Sen. *Her. O.* 1641 *populea silva, frontis Herculeae decus*[24].

soluto: *Apo koinou* with *vittis* and *honore*, in combination with *synesis* (*LHSz.* 435 ff.). See *Th.* II 339-40 *foedere rupto/ conubiisve*, Luc. VI 785-6 *vidi Decios...flentemque Camillum* with Housman's note. Esp. frequent with possessive pronouns, e.g. Catul. 56, 2 *auribus et tuo cachinno*, see *LHSz.* 834 ff.

27-8. versa...lyra: A sign of mourning. At the funeral of Roman magistrates the *fasces* were reversed: *Epic. Drusi* 141-2, Tac. *Ann.* III 2. Thence reversal of other things as a sign of mourning is mentioned: *Th.* V 71 *mutus Hymen versaeque faces*, VI 213-5, Verg. *A.* XI 93, Ov. *Pont.* III 4, 46 *versa lyra*, see Vollm.

For the symbolic function of the lyre, see *Th.* IV 35 *sublata lyra* = composing in the *genus sublime.*

The structure of 27-8 is like III 2, 131-2 *quanta votiva movebo/ plectra lyra.*

pectora: 17-8n., Schink 149-53. In Greek since Homer: στήθεα, στέρνα.

et diu: (M) is metrically impossible. Conjectures vary widely. Assuming *asyndeton*, the choice is between a verb (*dici*: Slater, *audiri*: Phill.[1]), a noun (*fletus*: Saenger, *cf.* V 2, 35 *comitem belli sociumque laborum*), a pronoun (*istius*: Merrill 86, *cf.* II 6, 13 *dolor iste*; but *istius* does not occur in St., while *illius* is always scanned *īllĭuš* (15 x)), or an adjective: *diri* (σ) and *duri* (Markl.) are rather lame, and never combined with *dolor* by St. Housman's *crudi* (1906, 37 f.), accepted by Phill. and Sb., has a parallel in *Th.* III 235 and is good palaeographically (*et udi*), but it does not fully convince me—though it is far superior to Marastoni's *assidui* ('*temptabam*').

Sed tu: Vollm. and Vahlen, accepted by Kl., Mozl., Clouard, Fr. (*in app.*) and Traglia seems best, chiefly because *tu* stresses the identification of St. and Melior (14-35n., 15-7n.): *te...tenui...plango...tu...me...te* (23-34). *Et diu* can have its origin in *set du.* For *tu...tui*: *Th.* VIII 507-8.

28-30. comitem...precor: 'I pray thee, assuaged at last, suffer me as a partner of thy mourning'.

comitem sociumque: The same combination occurs at V 2, 35 (above), Cic. *Marc.* 2, *Att.* XI 14, 1, Hor. *Carm.* I 7, 26, Sil. VI 334, Tac. *Ann.* III 15.

---

[24] The Condordance is not always able to discern between *frons/frontis* and *frons/frondis*: under *frons/frondis* occur 2 forms of the other *frons*: V 1, 64, V 2, 73. At I 2, 231 it prints **fronte** *virent postes.*

consortia: A very rare word before Christian authors, esp. in poetry: only here, *Th.* I 84, III 166, VFl. III 677 *consortia famae*, Sil. III 611, XIV 20. For metrical reasons it is always in the *plur.*, see *TLL* IV 488, 20 ff.

lenis: 'Calm', *cf.* 58-9 *tumentem leniet*, III 2, 4 *lenis...unda*, Mar. *Add.* p. 147.

30-5.: St. emphatically (the *polyptoton me...ego...mihi*) appeals to his experience in comforting, like III 3, 39-42. By doing this and by referring to his own loss (33-4), he suggests that his aim is to comfort, though the first part of the *epicedion* is mainly meant for grief, see *Intr.*, 1-36n. Skilfully he leads up to the idea that Glaucias and Melior had a deeper relationship than kinship, by first mentioning parents and children in general, then his own father. Thus he suggests with *cecini...mihi, cum gemerem...patrem* something like *cano...tibi, cum gemas...(plus quam) filium.*

30. Me: σ, all edd. *Iam*: M, a *Perseverationsfehler.*

fulmine: 'A disaster'. The *tert. comp.* is crushing power rather than suddenness (vs. 225), see *TLL* VI 1527, 56 ff., V 5, 20, *Th.* X 618, Cic. *Rep.* I 4, *Epic. Drusi* 11, Luc. V 770. Vollmer's "*gleich nach* (!) *dem plötzlichen Unglück*" is wrong. For other figurative uses of *fulmen* in St. see II 7, 93-7n., Thulin 513-4 (an incomplete account), Williams on *Th.* X 618.

31-2. patres...matribus: None of Statius' poems consoles a mother or a father (excluding St. himself in V 5). Statius' boast here and V 5, 38-9 may be put down to a mere *topos*, or it may refer to poems which St. composed but never wrote down. But Legras (1907, 339) and Newmyer (12) are probably right in adducing this passage as proof that St. did not include all his occasional poetry in the *Silvae*; note also *cecini*, on one line with *cantus* (5, 6, 29, *al.*), *canere* (8, 17, *al.*).

iuxta busta profusis: Prostrate near the pyre, *cf.* 24n., 170, III 3, 177. *Bustum proprie dicitur locus in quo mortuus est combustus et sepultus*: Paul. *Fest.* p. 29 (L.), e.g. V 3, 242.

atque: m, *at*: M

natis: In III 3, where St. comforts Claudius Etruscus.

33. mihi: V 3, a specific instance of a *pius natus.* This means that V 3 is one of the earlier pieces of the collection, perhaps not meant for publication, but included by the unknown editor(s) of Bk. V (see *Titulus* n.). Frère (192-4n.) is wrong in waving aside these vss. as evidence, see Cancik *Forschungsbericht* § 1 and II 2, 6n.

proprios ignes: 'The pyre (of my father) concerning me'. By *proprios* St. stresses his grief. For the adj. with *ignes* = pyre, *cf.* Sen. *Ag.* 648 *Hec-*

toreos...ignes; for the poetic plural: Bednara 553 (often in Lucr.). St., like Ovid, uses both *ignem* and *ignes* in the 6th foot, e.g. I 1, 91, III 1, 184, III 3, 40 (*ignem*) and II 4, 37, II 6, 37, IV 8, 37 (*ignes*).

defectus: 'Nearly fainted', *cf.* V 5, 40-3 *ego...solator...deficio...fomentaque quaero vulneribus*. There is no need for Waller's *deiectus* (pp. 14-5), in spite of III 3, 42 *proiectus ad ignem*, see *Th.* XII 379 *cari Polynicis ad ignes*, *OLD* under *ad* 13.

34. —quem, Natura!—: This punctuation is Gronovius' (1653); he probably interpreted: 'Whom, oh Nature! My own father'.

The current interpretation of *quem*, however, is *qualem* (for this use see Verg. *A.* IV 10-1 with Pease's note): 'I mourned, O Nature, what a father' (Mozl.). This goes against the—generally accepted—punctuation; moreover, in similar contexts St. appeals to Nature, not to praise the qualities of the departed, but to stress the tie of kinship: V 5, 22, *Th.* XI 607, see 82-6n. So the parenthesis must be kept (*cf.* I 6, 61, III 5, 49, V 5, 38) and the first interpretation, defended only by Håk. (49), is the correct one.

As Poliziano says, St. is *quasi singultu impeditus* in this short parenthesis.

35. arceo: The inf. with it occurs since Ov. *Met.* III 88, see *TLL* II 446, 46-73; see *Th.* I 455-6, *Ach.* I 686.

confer gemitus: 'Let us weep together', *cf.* III 3, 42 *confero questus*, II 4, 22. Participation in grief by the *consolator* is typical of the poetic *consolatio*. In prose παρηγορία and συνηγορία are distinguished sharply by Aristotle (*EN* 1171 a 29); in the extant prose consolations the *consolator* is never swept away by the sorrow of the *consolandus*, see E.-F. 123-4, who shows that the instances given by Vollm. (Sen. *Dial.* VI 6, 1, XII 2, 2 ff.) have their roots in a radically different attitude. See also *Intr.* and Kassel 51-2.

36-136. LAUDATIO: Mixed with *Lamentatio*, see *Intr.* and II 6, 58-70n. It can be divided into four main parts: **1)** The boy's appearance (36-54); **2)** his behaviour (56-66); **3)** his birth (72-105); **4)** his capacities (106-124).

1) and **2)** both open with a question (see *Intr.*) and end with explicit lamentation: *cuncta in cineres* (54-5) and *muta domus* (67-8). While these parts are mainly concerned with praise of the dead boy, in **3)** and **4)** praise of the master is the chief topic. The vss. 69-72 are a transition between the two greater parts, see note there.

3) ends with a compliment on Melior's character (102-5); after **4)** the vss. 124-7 are a new transition to another elaborate compliment to

Melior (128-36) for his generosity. Its last verse points back to the beginning of the *laudatio* (see *infra*) and to the beginning of its second part in 3): 72, 77/136.

Throughout the *laudatio* details of the boy's behaviour and his relationship with his master are described with loving care, esp. in 51, 55-6, 110-9, *cf.* II 6 *Intr.* and II 6, 20n.

But the most striking element is the stress St. puts on beauty and brilliance:

forma (41 ff.) opens the *laudatio*, after St. has rhetorically wondered where to start (36-40). The same concept also ends it: *decori* 136; see also *decor* 103, 136, *decorus* 44, 115, *decus* 155. Beauty also is the *tert.comp.* between Glaucias and Hylas and Hyacinthus (112-3); it is one of Invidia's two gifts (122). Glaucias' beauty would restrain even the most cruel people from killing him (139 ff.); together with his youth it is the main reason to mourn him (178).

Beauty then, especially in human beings, is one of Sts.' main concerns. Though this is natural for a composer of laudatory poems, St. seems more interested in it than other poets: he pays his tribute to it both in *consolationes* (II 6, 34-47—see 38n.—, V 1, 51-4, 150. This is also prescribed by Menander 125, 7 *Sp.*, see Lohrisch 17-20) and elsewhere (I 2, 172, II 7, 85-6, III 3, 111-4, III 4 esp. 26-98, III 5, 63, IV 4, 8).

Beauty is also frequently mentioned in Greek epitaphs: *IG* XII 7, 239, 20-2 ἐν τῷ ἀκμαιοτάτῳ κάλλους καὶ ἡλικίας καθεστῶσα, *IG* V 2, 417, 11, see Robert 1965, 36, Vérilhac nos. 31-47 (beauty not always explicitly mentioned). But it is not emphasized, as in St. Combined with intellect: Vérilhac nos. 55, 57, 58, 59, with εὐεπίῃ: Vérilhac no. 56, with παιδεία: no. 60. Most of these inscriptions are posterior to St.

Splendour and colour also stand out: *purpureo...candor* (41), *siderei...radiata...lumina caelo* (42), *lactea* (50), *lucida* (79), *nitidis* (94), *rosea* (116), *puniceo* (132), *herbas imitante...rubenti* (133), *incendere gemmis* (134), see *purpureo* (159). These terms are common enough in themselves, but their proportion (far higher than for instance in the *Epic. Drusi*) testifies to Sts.' interest.

Cancik has shown that splendour ('*Glanz*') is one of Sts.' main aesthetic categories (1965, 45-6, 48 and n. 45, 77-82, *cf.* Szelest 1966, 189, 195, Newmyer 99 ff.). It is stressed in the descriptions of light playing upon water (II 2, 45-9n., see II 3 *Intr.*) and of marble and other costly materials (II 2, 85-93n., *cf.* II 4, 11-5, 26-8n.). Sts.' frequent use of *nitere, fulgere* etc., also for persons (II 2, 10n.), is another illustration of it.

It is often maintained that St. followed rhetorical models especially in his descriptions and praises (e.g. Lohrisch, Vollm., Szelest 1966, 189—but see Szelest 1972, 89-90). But the differences between St. and

Menander's prescriptions are important: in the first place the sequence of Sts.' praises here is *forma, indoles, ortus, genus*, whereas Menander commends the order *genus, ortus, forma corporis, indoles animi* (illustrated by *anatrophe, paideia, virtutes, res gestae*): 420, 11 *Sp., cf.* 413, 12 ff., see *Intr.* under **I.** on the relationship between St. and rhetorical theory.

More specifically, many scholars regard the description of Glaucias as an *ekphrasis*, an exercise of the schools of rhetoric: Fr. 57 n. 4, E.-F. 132 § 17, more general Vollm. *Einl.* 26-7, I 1 *Vorbemerkung.*

However, the *ekphrasis* as a separate exercise is a late phenomenon, and even then it is not more than a '*Muster für Schulaufsätze*' (P. Friedländer 1912, 85. See 83: '*Man pflegt heut literargeschichtliche Fragen...mit dem Schlagwort "rhetorische Ekphrasis" mehr scheinbar als wirklich zu beantworten*', see *Intr.* under **I.** here, II 2 *Intr.* under **I**).

Moreover, the descriptions of persons in literature generally proceed from head to foot: Ov. *Am.* I 15, 17 ff., *Met.* I 497 ff., III 420 ff., *Ep.* 20, 54 ff., *AP* V 48. A classic example is Petronius' description of the girl Circe (126, 12-5, possibly a parody): *crines, frons, supercilia, lumina, nares, osculum, mentum, cervix, manus, pedes.* This scheme, 'a person must be described from head to foot', was codified by Aphthonius in the 4th/5th century A.D. (II 46 *Sp.*, see P. Friedländer 86 n. 3).

Neither here nor in II 6 does St. conform to any such scheme: his description of the boy is arranged according to colour and splendour (41-5) and to his relationship with Melior (45-51). Late *ekphraseis* often make use of abstract rhetorical categories (*argumentum a loco, a tempore etc.*), or of rigid schemes (the 4 elements, the 5 senses), see Curtius 78, 200, Hamon 477 ff. But St. can virtually never be shown to follow similar rules.

36. Addressing the dead one: At the beginning of the *laudatio* happens also in III 3, 43, V 1, 43, *cf.* II 4, 1, II 5, 1, *Laus Pis.* 1-2, *Eleg. Maec.* 9.

dignos aditus laudumque...primordia: 'An approach to and a way to begin with worthy of you'. *Dignos* and *laudum* are both *apo koinou.* For *aditus*: *TLL* I 707, 11 ff. The poetic plur. occurs since Verg. *A.* IV 293, see Schink 26-7. *Primordia*: Quint. *Inst.* I 9, 1 *quaedam dicendi primordia.* The implication is: this is the beginning of the *laudatio*, see II 6, 55-7n., II 7, 100-4n.

37. O merito dilecte puer: II 4, 32, Hor. *Carm.* II 20, 7, Ov. *Met.* III 500 *o frustra dilecte puer*, VFl. IV 468, Paul. Nol. *Carm.* 6, 43.

38-9. Hinc...ac...inde: M has *huic...hic...inde*, which Poggio corrected to *hinc...hinc...inde*, while Courtney (1966, 98) proposed *hinc...ac...inde* (without a discussion). Poggio's conjecture suggests that St. is torn be-

tween youth, beauty and precocious probity as subjects. But youth is never praised in itself (E.-F. 134 § 23), only in combination with maturity (below), or in lamenting the early death of a beautiful one (52, *cf.* 139, 179 *formaque aevoque*). Thence I consider (*h*)*uic*...(*h*)*ic* as a *Perseverationsfehler* and read *ac*, making St. mention here youthful beauty on the one hand and early virtue on the other, *cf.* II 6, 42-9.

limine vitae: 'The threshold of life'. The expression is used for birth, the beginning of life: IV 2, 13, see *Th.* VII 166, Lucr. III 681. Thence (*primo*) *in limine vitae* can also be explained as 'in the first stage of life', 'at the outset of real, adult life': *Th.* V 534, Verg. *A.* VI 427 (with Norden's note), Luc. II 106, Claud. *IIIcons.Hon.* 10, *CE* 1385 (565 A.D.) *limine quem primo sustulit atra dies*, see *TLL* VII² 1407, 67 ff. This is what St. means here; see also V 3, 72 *limine primo fatorum* and II 6, 70-2n. In the same way *astra salutare* is used for birth in vs. 80, *vitam salutare* for growing up in V 3, 133.

rapit, rapit: Such repetitions are mostly confined to names at the end of one verse and the beginning of the next: *LHSz.* 812-3, Vollm. on I 2, 197 and IV 6, 36, Bömer on Ov. *Met.* V 300. Similar instances within the verse are II 3, 38, *Th.* X 428 *rogat en rogat*, Verg. *G.* I 77-8 *urit...urit.../urunt*, Ov. *Met.* V 304, VII 68 *aut siquid metuam, metuam de coniuge solo*, 445, 779, 830, *cf.* VI 273, IX 364. Not within the verse: II 1, 218-9, V 3, 262-3 *vidit,/vidit.* Repetition has an emotional value, *cf.* Tydeus' violent speech *Th.* III 348 ff. *Arma arma...arma...iuvat isse, iuvat...bello...bello...nunc o nunc...nunc...* See also II 2, 42-4n., 68-72n.

rapere is a favourite word in first-century poetry, used in many different contexts, see Hübner 1975, 206 n. 47. It is not significantly more frequent in the Thebaid than in the *Silvae.* See also 208-9n.

praecox: The idea of precocity is frequent in all literature of consolation, also in later theory: vs. 40, 109, 119, II 6, 49, *Epic. Drusi* 335-40, *Eleg. Maec.* 149, Sen. *Dial.* VI 23, 3 *senilem in iuvene prudentiam*, Plin. *Ep.* V 16, 2, Dion. Hal. *Rhet.* V 23, Theon II 110, 23 *Sp.*, see E.-F. 134 § 23B and esp. Vollm.

Praise of precocity is one form of the '*puer-senex-topos*': The combination of the best qualities of youth and maturity, or old age, is extolled, Cic. *Sen.* 11, 38 *ut enim adulescentem in quo est senile aliquid, sic senem in quo est aliquid adulescentis probo*, Verg. *A.* IX 311 *ante annos animumque gerens curamque virilem*, Ov. *Pont.* II 2, 71 *praeterit ipse suos animo Germanicus annos* (the example of our vs. and *Epic. Drusi* 447). The ideal of youth combined with the wisdom of old age (instead of adultness) is esp. popular in Flavian times (but see Cic. above): Sil. VIII 464 *corde sagaci aequabat senium*, Plin. *Ep. loc. cit.*, parodied by Petr. 28, 4: the *vetulus puer* of Trimalchio. In inscriptions it is not attested before the first cent. A.D.,

see Griessmair 51-2, e.g. Vérilhac no. 29, 1-2; 30, 3-4. In late antiquity it becomes a commonplace. Sometimes it is given a Christian turn: Man can free himself from the fetters of his physical age by force of mind.

The theme of precocity in itself is very ancient and not specifically Roman: Aesch. *Sept.* 622, Soph. *frg.* 210, 73 *P.* In St.: III 3, 67-8, IV 4, 45, V 2, 13, *Th.* VI 756-7 *maturius aevo robur*, XI 34, *Ach.* I 148. See Curtius 108-12 and for important corrections and recent literature Eyben 1977, 64-6.

Another parallel was noted by Scaliger *in mg.* Leyden UB 757 G 37: *Qui limina nondum tetigit puberis aevi/ sed mente senili teneros praevenit annos.*

40. probitas: Can refer both to moral uprightness (V 1, 117, 154, V 2, 73) and sexual purity (I 2, 12, III 5, 17, 67), see *OLD.* On the face of it the first meaning fits best, sexual purity being unconnected with age; but Sts.' main concern is to evoke a series of concepts connected with chastity and purity: *modestia, pudor, probitas* = modesty, a sense of propriety and probity. For this combination, see esp. Luc. VIII 156 *pudor...probitas castique modestia vultus*, also III 5, 67, V 1, 117, V 2, 72-3 *pudor et docti legem sibi dicere mores* (= *modestia*)...*hilaris probitas*, Cic. *De Orat.* I 122, *Fin.* II 73 *pudor...modestia...pudicitia, Anth. Lat.* 812, 7 ff. (Bücheler-Riese I 2 p. 299) *pudor...sacri reverentia pectoris...*(11) *forma decorque ingeniumque ferax omni probitate.* Throughout the *laudatio* St. is anxious to stress the boy's purity: *castigatae, modestia* (43), *verecundo* (136).

For the theme, see Vérilhac no. 60 (2nd/1st cent. B.C.), 3-4 ἐπέπρεπες...αἰδοῖ ἥλικας (*cf.* 106-9n.), *CE* 1186 (2nd cent. A.D.), 13 *ille...sancta et formata verecundia.*

41. O ubi: Monosyllabic interjections are never elided in Latin dactylic poetry between Cicero and Statius: the most usual of them (*o, a, heu*) consist of vowels only, and elision would detract from their pathetic character, which, if anything, needs emphasizing by hiatus.

Hiatus is especially frequent in the case of *o*, almost always without shortening. The most common formulas are *o ego* and *o utinam*, in the *Silvae: o ubi* and *o utinam.* In the *Silvae o* occurs 26 times, hiatus with it 3 times: here, 51, V 1, 178. In the epics about 80 times, with hiatus 7 times. This means that in this respect there is no significant difference between Sts.' two kinds of poetry—but the data for the *Silvae* are few. See O. Müller 1861, 17, Heuvel on *Th.* I 22, Soubiran 78-80, 403-4 with many examples in other poets.

purpureo...candor: A flushed pale complexion was a common ideal of beauty, see Mulder on *Th.* II 231 for an evaluation of the ancient evidence. *Purpureus*, however, is used rarely in poetry, *roseus* or *ruber* being more usual: André 1949, 325. *Purpureus* occurs also at Sen. *Phaed.*

376, *cf.* Verg. *A.* XI 819. St. generally is more imaginative in his descriptions of this complexion, e.g. *Ach.* I 161-2 *niveo natat ignis in ore/ purpureus.* See also II 2, 85-9n.

suffusus: Is also common in this connection: Ov. *Met.* I 484 (*illa*) *suffuderat ora rubore, Am.* III 3, 5, *Hal.* 123, *Ciris* 226.

42. siderei orbes radiata...lumina caelo: The last three words are either corrupt or the syntax is completely idiosyncratic. All translations render something like 'radiant with heaven's light' (Mozl.). But *radiata* does not simply mean 'radiant' nor is there any parallel for *caelum* as 'heavenly light'.

radiatus rather means 'furnished with rays': Lucr. V 463 *radiati lumina solis*, 700 *radiatum insigne diei*, both alluding to an aureole, see Bömer on *Met.* IV 193 *radiataque lumina*, Plin. *Pan.* 52, Suet. *Aug.* 94, 6. Vollm. claims that *radiatus* + abl. occurs at Ov. *Pont.* III 4, 103, but there *radientur* is read. The regular word for 'radiant' is *radians* (Bömer *loc. cit.*), e.g. *CE* 1109, 9 *sidereo radiantem lumine formam.* There is found one other deviant use of *radiatus*, Sil. VIII 168, where it means 'hit by the rays of the sun'.

Since *radiatus* does not mean 'shining' and *caelo* could hardly be a dative of direction, the whole expression is obscure. *Met.* IV 193 may well have influenced St., but I find it impossible to conclude from it what St. wrote. The words seem right, but the syntax wrong. It may have been *radiati lumina caeli*, 'the light from heaven with its rays', but there are not enough grounds for a decision.

The use of *caelum* with the connotation either of 'brilliancy' or '(blue) colour' is not referred to in *TLL.*

So I revoke my former opinion (1980, 380) that these words can stand, insofar as I cannot explain them in this form.

However, two things about this verse as a whole are clear: the eyes are compared to heavenly bodies and St. has used as many words connoting 'radiance' as he could.

The comparison of the eyes to stars is a commonplace of (esp. erotic) poetry: I 1, 103-4 (*cf.* II 6, 42), *Th.* V 613, IX 702, *Ach.* I 35, Prop. II 3, 14 *oculi, geminae, sidera nostra, faces*, Ov. *Am.* II 16, 44, III 3, 9 *radiant ut sidus ocelli*, 19, 55-6, *Met.* I 498-9, III 420 with Bömer's note, IV 347-9, *Ep.* 20, 57-8, *Pont.* II 3, 14. It is a favourit conceit of Petrarchist poetry.

St. and Martial seen to be the first to use *sidereus* for human beings, see Vollmer: here and at *Th.* V 613. For divinities at I 2, 141, VFl. II 104, IV 330, Sen. *Oed.* 409. *Silv.* I 1, 103-4 is a borderline case, since its subject is Domitian (Cancik 1965, 98-9, Sauter 137-53).

How St. handles traditional material is especially clear in his use of *orbes, lumina*: both words together are used for eyes at Luc. II 184-5, Sil. IX 400. But, unlike St., they do not play on their double meaning of heavenly bodies and eyes.

43. castigatae collecta modestia frontis: *Modestia* again expresses the virtue: both Glaucias' character and his forehead are modest, see *ingenuus* below. *Collecta*: small, compact: Calp. *Decl.* 2 *illic effusiora corpora, illic collectiora nascuntur*, see *OLD* 14. It refers, by enallage, to the forehead itself. A small forehead was considered beautiful: Hor. *Carm.* I 33, 5 with Nisbet-H., *Ep.* I 7, 26, Petr. 126, 15, Mart. IV 42, 9.

castigatae: Taut, without wrinkles: *Th.* VI 871-2 *arta cutis (et) castigata*, Ov. *Am.* I 5, 21 *castigato planus sub pectore venter*, Ser. Samm. 353 *castigatas...papillas*, *TLL* III 536, 57 ff. Vollm., after Domitius, wrongly interprets 'small'.

In this vs. the inner and the outer being are mixed (*modestia, castigatae*). Vollm. suggests a connection with the writings of the physiognomists. The central thesis of physiognomy is that the form of the face and of the body are indexes of someone's character. Physiognomy as a science seems to have arrived in Rome (from Greece) by the first century A.D., see Evans, with notes 1-5 for literature. But the proofs for this contention are only to be found in literature and it is far more probable that science later codified and systematized the general and obvious but unscientific claims proferred in literature (thus Schmidt in *RE* XX[1] 1064-74, esp. 1071 criticizing Evans).

In Latin writers the most important parts of the body are the eyes and the forehead: Cic. *De Orat.* III 216 *in ore sunt omnia, in eo autem ipso dominatus est omnis oculorum, Paneg.* II 37, 2 (*ut*) *in speculo frontium imago exstet animorum.*

Brilliant eyes were sometimes considered as a sign of great, or even divine, thoughts: Suet. *Aug.* 79, 2 *oculos habuit claros ac nitidos quibus etiam existimari volebat inesse quiddam divini vigoris, gaudebatque si quis sibi acrius contuenti quasi ad fulgorem solis vultum summitteret*, Amm. XXV 4, 22 *oculorum micantium...qui mentis eius angustias indicabant*, Evans 66 n. 3, 73 n. 3.

The forehead was a proverbial index of someone's mood or mind: Pl. *Aul.* 599, Cic. *De Orat.* III 221 *fronte quae est animi ianua*, Hor. *Epod.* 13, 5, Phaed. IV 2, 5-6, Plin. *Nat.* XI 138 *frons...hominis hilaritatis, tristitiae, clementiae, severitatis index*, Quint. *Inst.* XII 3, 12, Mart. I 24, 4, VI 39, 12, Juv. 2, 8; 9, 2, Apul. *Apol.* 40, *OLD* under *frons* 2a, Otto 1890 n° 717 and *Nachträge* pp. 40-1, 103, 237, 272, *cf.* 214.

A small forehead could be a sign of a mobile mind: Plin. *Nat.* XI 274, quoting Pompeius Trogus, *Frons quibus est magna segnem animum subesse significat, quibus parva mobilem,* Evans 59, II 2, 147-9n., II 6, 66n.

44-5. ingenui...crines: 'Artless locks'. For *ingenuus* = 'natural', see Prop. I 4, 13 *ingenuus color,* Petr. 126 *crines ingenio suo flexi,* Juv. 3, 20, Plin. *Ep.* I 14, 8. St., like Prop. (see Rothstein there), means both 'natural' and 'like a free-born person', alluding to the 'slave/child-*topos*', see *Intr.*

mollis: In *enallage* here for *mollis coma,* soft hair, as *Th.* IX 375, Verg. *A.* II 683, Ov. *Met.* XIV 554, Sen. *Ag.* 712, Mart. IV 42, 7, see *molles capilli* in Hor. *Ars* 33, Ov. *Pont.* III 3, 17, Amm. XXII 11, 28, XXV 4, 22, *TLL* III 1749, 35-6 and 318, 22-3, VIII 1374, 24-40. *Mollis* can not be taken with *margo*: *TLL* (VIII 394, 17 ff.) gives no parallel or possible interpretation of this combination.

margo: For this strange use, *viz.* for the fringe of hair, there exists no suitable parallel, see *TLL* VIII 395, 56 ff. An equally strange use occurs at III 2, 53 *suspensos oculorum in margine fletus.*

comae: For St., hair is an important motif: III 4 is dedicated to the hair of the eunuch Earinus, and in the Thebaid Parthenopaeus is rarely mentioned without some reference to his hair, see II 6, 41-2n. St. is attracted to this theme, important in the sculpture of his time (and in renaissance and baroque poetry and painting), because of the brilliancy and mobility of hair, *cf.* 115, 122, 162, Cancik 1965, 56-61 with notes (important).

45-6.: 'The mouth tattling with sweet complaints and the lips redolent of vernal blossoms when you kissed'.

blandus: One of Sts.' favourite words (49 times, 25 in the *Silvae*). For the combination with *querela,* see 14-5n. (contrast V 1, 22 *rabidis... querelis*) and *querela* in II 4, 30 (n.); for *blandus* in St., see also *Th.* X 158 *vis blanda,* 836 *irae -ae,* III 2, 119 *-o veneno.*

impliciti: 'When embracing'. Not 'embraced'; in this last sense it occurs at *Th.* I 65, VFl. I 264. The normal meaning of the past part. is 'embracing': *Th.* X 718-9, XI 518, III 3, 18 (where *implicitus* must be read for *implicitor,* see Håk. 89-90), see Heuvel on *Th.* I 65. Here it is on one line with *loquentis* 47.

vernos...flores: Possibly a foreshadowing of Glaucias' early death, *cf.* 106-7, where his death is compared to that of spring flowers, Mart. V 37, 9 (a dead girl) *fragravit ore quod rosarium Paesti,* 106-9n., 113-9n.

oscula: 'Lips' as in 173 (n.) rather than 'kisses'. The first is suggested by the passage from Martial above and III 2, 57 *dissipat amplexus atque oscula...revellit,* the second by I 2, 207-8 *dulcia...oscula* and *Th.* III 151-2

hos complexus...haec oscula tueor. But *oscula* following on *ora* makes 'lips' more probable, see *orbes...lumina, crines...comae* in 42-5.

47. Mixtae risu lacrimae: One of those fusions of opposites which St. likes so much (*Intr.*, II 2, 45-62n., II 6, 38-47n.): *Th.* VI 164 *lacrimosos...risus*, IX 820, V 2, 10, V 3, 217, Mart. X 78, 8 *udo...gaudio.* It goes back upon Homer's δακρυόεν γελάσασα (*Od.* VI 484). These parallels do by no means refer only to children and St. clearly favours these phrases.

47-8. penitusque...vox mixta favis: 'A voice as sweet as/ sweeter than honey' is a commonplace of ancient literature since Homer's μέλιτος γλυκίων αὐδή about Nestor (*Il.* I 249), *cf.* Plin. *Ep.* IV 3, 3 *illa Homerici senis mella.* See Otto 1890 nos. 1081, 1224, *Nachträge* pp. 110, 185, 240, 279.

For the theme, see also Vérilhac n° 34 (3rd cent. A.D.): (the parents) τὴν σὴν μολπὴν ζητοῦντες ἐν οἴκῳ. She remarks: '*l'évocation, rare dans la poésie funéraire, de la voix du défunt*'.

mixta, however, has been rejected by several scholars (*pasta*: Heinsius IV *cap.* 1, *tincta*: Markland, *multa* (= *mulsa*): Housman 1906, *mersa*: Saenger). Two reasons are adduced: it repeats *mixtae* (46), which is especially suspect since the sense is different; and 'a voice mixed with honey' is not the same as 'a voice as sweet as honey' (esp. Housman).

The first argument is unsatisfactory, see 128-30n., 169-72n. and II 2, 68-72n. The second argument seems better: *TLL* VIII 1088, 15-29 and 1088, 73-1089, 48 offer no really suitable parallel (Sil. II 252 *lamentis vox mixta* is different, but see *Th.* III 383 *mixtus lacrimis...dolor*). On the other hand, Fr. aptly quotes I 1, 15 *ora...mixta belli notis* for another strange use, *cf.* also II 2, 32 *permixti pulvere soles.* Maybe, moreover, *mixta* is a more or less unconscious echo of Lucr. VI 1244 *blandaque lassorum vox mixta voce querelae* (see 45 here).

penitus: 'thoroughly' (to be taken with *mixta*): II 4, 18, IV 4, 101 *penitus voti, Th.* IX 555.

Hyblaeis: Three cities in Sicily called Hybla are known. (*RE* IX 25-9). The one known as Megara Hyblaea, using a bee on its coins, was famous for honey in antiquity: Strabo IV 267, Plin. *Nat.* XI 32. This became proverbial: Verg. *Ecl.* 1, 54, Ov. *Pont.* IV 15, 10 *Hybla favos* = Claud. *Carm.* 14, 8, Otto 1890, n° 835, *Nachträge* 105, 172, 274, Blümner 1911, 192, *RE loc. cit.*

48-9.: Glaucias' voice is so sweet that snakes would stop hissing at its sound and cruel step-mothers would happily subject themselves to its commands.

St. alludes to the incantation of snakes and to the proverbial cruelty of step-mothers, not specifically to Iuno and Heracles, as was assumed by some earlier commentators. This is shown by V 2, 79-80 *qui voce potes praevertere morsus/ serpentum atque omnis vultu placere novercas.*

For the incantation of snakes: Lucil. 576-7 (Krenkel), Pomponius *CRF* 118 (Ribbeck), Verg. *A.* VII 753-4 *hydris spargere qui somnos cantu manuque solebat mulcebatque iras*, Tib. I 8, 20, Luc. IX 913-4, Petr. 134, 12 vs. 24-5, Sil. III 301-2 *ad quorum cantus serpens oblita veneni, ad quorum tactum mites iacuere cerastae*, Gel. XVI 11, 1, Ennod. *Carm.* I 2, 16 (an imitation of St.) *melle tuo serpens gutturis arma premit.* Other passages refer to the exploding of snakes by magical means: Verg. *Ecl.* 8, 71, Ov. *Am.* II 1, 25, *Med.* 39, *Met.* VII 203 (with Bömer), Man. I 92, [Quint.] *Decl.* 10, 15.

The cruelty of step-mothers: Hier. *Ep.* 54, 15 *omnes...communes rhetorum loci in novercam saevissimam declamabunt* (e.g. Sen. *Con.* IV 6, IX 5). Many references in Otto 1890, n[os] 1239-41, *Nachträge* 61, 76-7, 113, 194-5, 241, 282. With *saeva*: Verg. *G.* II 128, Luc. IV 637, VFl. I 287, III 580, V 188, Quint. *Inst.* II 10, 5.

There is a climax in thought here (8-12n.): *saevae* 'in spite of their cruelty'; *servire*: a strong word, alluding to the thought that Glaucias is free in a sense (44-5, 77 ff.); thus *noverca* preludes on the opposition parents/ foster-parents, *cf.* Quint. *Inst.* XII 1, 2 *non parens...sed noverca.*

sibila: The plur. is *metri causa*, see Schubert 36 for verses from the Thebaid, Fortgens on *Th.* VI 248. Not in Vergil, but common in Ovid: Schink 118, Bömer on *Met.* III 38.

ponere: Is used as if it were *deponere* (*OLD* 10). In the *Silvae* also at I 2, 33, I 3, 21, II 1, 183, II 2, 26, II 6, 103, II 7, 39, V 1, 224.

poneret et: Repetition of syllables is sometimes considered as artistic playfulness, but more often as cacophony: *Rhet Her.* IV 12, 18 *vitabimus eiusdem litterae nimiam assiduitatem*, Isocr. *Techne frg.* 4. This is the reason why Servius criticizes Vergil's *Dorica castra* (*A.* II 27, VI 88): *mala est compositio.* Nevertheless these repetitions are very common, probably out of carelessness, since they abound in Ovid and in the unfinished Aeneid, but are rare in the Bucolics, Georgics and Horace's Odes. We must, however, not exclude the possibility that this cacophonous effect was less objected to in imperial times, at any rate in some common formulas, as *quisquis is* (I 6, 49, V 5, 65, *Th.* III 612, Ov. *Ep.* 19, 217, *Met.* XIII 468, *Ibis* 9): see Marouzeau 1935, 42-5, Herescu 1960, 39-59 (many examples; more literature on p. 44 n. 1), Bömer on Ov. *Met.* II 97. Vollm. on III 3, 12 gives five examples from St.

-et et occurs also in 61, 193, 207, II 2, 91, see *Th.* I 43, Verg. *A.* III 627 *manderet et*, Pers. 5, 25 *crepet et.*

In *Silv.* II the following occurrences of other repetitions are found: *quererere* (78), II 2, 134 *veherere,* II 6, 65 *paterere*: Verg. *A.* IV 350 *quaerere regna,* V 222 *currere remis,* Ov. *Ars* II 111 *mirere relictum, Tr.* I 8, 46 *agerere reus.* Double *re*: Catul. 61, 33, Verg. *A.* II 108, IX 257, Prop. I 6, 33, II 32, 16, Ov. *Am.* I 6, 42, *Ars* II 731, *Met.* VIII 197.

II 2, 94 *obversa salutant,* Mart. XIII 23, 2. *Silv.* II 2, 100 *saepe per autumnum,* Catul. 64, 177, Hor. *Ep.* I 18, 110. *Silv.* II 3, 3: see note there. *Silv.* II 3, 9 *velit it, Th.* I 369 *haurit iter,* Ov. *Met.* II 133, 170, 730. *Silv.* II 3, 55 *incubat atque. Silv.* II 4, 21 *soror orba, Silv.* II 7, 63 *iucunda dabis.*

Vollmer claims that St. rarely repeats syllables. But these 15 examples in less than 800 verses are not so few. Except for those with *-re* they could all have been avoided. A connection with the improvised character of the *Silvae* seems possible. In Thebaid I-III I found only 6 examples.

50. Nil veris adfingo bonis: For other rhetorical formulas protesting the truth of Sts.' statements: II 6, 29, I 1, 17 *nec veris maiora putes.* For different rhetorical formulas, see 21-2n., 96n., 157-8n., 213-8n., II 2 *Intr.* under **II**, II 2, 64n., II 2, 72-5n., II 3, 35n., II 6, 21-33n., 29n.

These oddly prosaic turns have roots in the ancient question about the truth of poetry: since Plato and Aristotle it had been granted that poetry does not need truth but verisimilitude. The *fallacia vatum* (*Aetna* 29) was seen both as a positive quality (Ov. *Am.* III 12, 41-2 *fecunda licentia vatum,* Luc. IX 359-60 *Invidus...qui vates ad vera vocat*) and as something to be reprehended (*Aetna* 29, 74-6).

In didactic or scientific poetry a claim to truth is sometimes made (whether or not criticizing other poetry): Ov. *Fast.* VI 3 *facta canam, sed erunt qui me finxisse loquantur, Aetna* 91-2 *omnis in vero mihi cura,* see Kroll 1924, 44-63, Sudhaus on *Aetna* 74-93.

St. seems to be especially concerned about the credibility of his consolations, see 22n., II 6, 29n.

50-1. lactea colla: An epic formula, see Verg. *A.* VIII 660. In non-epic poetry *candida colla* is usual (e.g. Ov. *Am.* I 5, 10, *Ars* II 457): André 1949, 368-9, but it also occurs at Mart. I 31, 6, see Citroni there and II 6, 43-5n., *cf.* 15-7n. above. St. is imitated by Nemes. *Ecl.* 2, 80, Sid. *Carm.* 11, 110, Paul. Nol. *Carm.* 31, 36.

For the plur. *colla*: 17-8n., Maas 533, 541, Bednara 542, Schink 139-41.

bracchiaque nunquam domini sine pondere cervix: Thus M, unmetrically. The parallels (and common sense) show that St., like in 46, 66, must mean that Glaucias hung on Melior's neck: I 2, 183 *tenera matris cervice pependit,* III 2, 58, 132, Prop. III 12, 22, IV 11, 76, Ov. *Met.*

I 485 *inque patris blandis haerens cervice lacertis, Ep.* 8, 91, VFl. I 259, Plin. *Ep.* V 16, 3 (his deceased daughter) *ut illa patris cervicibus inhaerebat!*

Saftien's *quo* (in Vollm. *Add.* X) is the best way to restore this sense and accepted by Vollm., Postg., Phill., Mozl., Fr.; as *heu quo iam* by Saenger.

M's *que* was interpreted as *quae* by M^2 and accepted, with various related emendations, by Phill. *app.*, Merrill 87 and apparently Courtney 1971, 96 'Melior was forever leaning on it' (!). This same improbable explanation is the most obvious one if we read *bracchiaque et* (FKQR), like Baehr., Klotz, Vollm., Mar. and Traglia. Vollm. and Mar. (*Add.* 144) however explain this text as *et domini cervix quae nunquam sine pondere Glauciae est.* But the sequence *heu colla et bracchia* (*Glauciae*) *et domini cervix* seems impossible.

When accepting, as I do, Saftien's *quo, colla, bracchia* form an asyndeton, which seems somewhat strange in this enumeration. This would be removed by Postgate's *colla et* (1905, 121). On the other hand *et* never ends a verse in the *Silvae.* To the asyndeton may be compared III 5, 45, V 3, 147, see also II 3, 45, III 1, 145, 173, V 3, 280, *Th.* X 299.

Saftien's original proposal was *colla!/ Bracchia quo...*, accepted by Håk. 106. For this exclamatory sentence I 1, 41 is a parallel. But, as Vollm. points out, it is preferable to explain *lactea* as used *apo koinou.*

The verse then reads *bracchia quo nunquam domini sine pondere cervix* and means 'those arms without the weight of which his master's neck never was'. Constructions somewhat similar to *bracchia, quo...pondere* are II 2, 34-5 (*porticus*) *qualis...fert semita,* II 3, 76 *hoc, quae...revirescet gloria.*

For *domini,* see *Intr.* under **II**. For the hyperbole in *nunquam,* see II 4, 33, II 6, 52.

52-4. spes non longinqua iuventae: 'That hope of not far distant manhood'. *Longinquus,* 'long-deferred' (*OLD* 3): *Th.* XII 339 *spes longinqua viae,* Tac. *Ann.* XIII 37 *omissa spe longinqua et sera.* See *longus* '(of expectations) slow in being fulfilled' *OLD* 14d: *Th.* II 321 (with Mulder) *spes...longa,* Hor. *Carm.* I 4, 15 (*in bonam partem*), *cf. Th.* I 322-3 *spes...longo voto.*

Iuventae in general terms announces the beard, *honos, barba,* see III 3, 67 *ora nova mutante iuventa,* V 2, 62-3 *Nondum validae tibi signa iuventae/ inrepsere genis.* It is praised also at II 6, 44(n.), *cf.* Men. 436, 17-8 *Sp.*, Vérilhac n° 33, 3-4 ἀλλά με Μοῖρ' ὀλοή, πρὶν ἰούλοις πλῆσαι παρειαίς ἥρπασε. A good example of Sts.' ability to reason in both parts is III 4, 65-6 *ne genas lanugo carperet,* see 8-9n., 202-5n., II 7, 128-31n.

To conclude from *iuventae* that Glaucias had almost deposited the *toga puerilis* and *therefore* was 13 years old (instead of 12, see 124n.), as Fr. does

(57 n. 2), is absurd: *venturae* is very general, and there are many individual differences in the age for assuming the *toga virilis*. Whether Glaucias was thirteen or twelve, he would have been very young for it: Marquardt 123 ff., Maurin 222.

venturae: The future part. is frequent in poetry, because of its brevity and metrical convenience, esp. since Ovid: *LHSz.* 390, Bömer on Ov. *Met.* V 271.

In *Silv.* II, as in earlier poetry, it is used predicatively: 106, 210, II 3, 63, 76, II 4, 4 (all with a reference to dying!), II 6, 27. Its attributive use: 145, 162. In an address: II 7, 43. This is frequent in poetry: Bömer *loc. cit.*, e.g. V 1, 177, Hor., *Carm.* II 3, 4, Ov. *Met.* II 280.

honos: Is more frequent in St. than *honor*, just as in VFl., Sil., Mart., but unlike Hor. and Ov., see *TLL* VI[3] 2916, 16 ff. In the *Silvae honor* occurs only three times: I 1, 18, II 7, 5, III 2, 14, probably for reasons of euphony[25].

iurata: That Melior used to swear on Glaucias' as yet non-existent beard has troubled some critics: *curata*: Damsté (1923, 150), which would not be less strange; *iuranda*: Merrill (87), explaining *quam iuraturus fuisset Melior.*

The correct explanation was given by Gronovius in 1637 (95 ff.): Melior used to swear (to do something or other) if Glaucias would grow up to be a man. Thus Opheltes' father says at *Th.* VI 197-9 *alio...pacto, Iuppiter, hunc crinem* (his own) *voti reus ante dicaram, si pariter viridis nati libare dedisses...genas.* Similarly Melior used to swear *si Glauciae salvo barbam ponere liceat*, see Fortgens on *Th.* VI 197-9, Håk. 43 n. 54.

Barth has a long and immensely learned note on the custom of swearing by (parts of) the body of beloved people (e.g. Verg. *A.* IX 300), see also Vollm. and Fr. 57 n. 3, but this is different. Sen. *Dial.* XI 17, 1, however, may imply the same thing as this vs. (*Fortuna*) *manus...ne ab eis quidem per quos iuramus abstinet.*

tibi: *Meliori.* Dative of agent. Not *Glauciae*, like some older commentators (even Markland) thought.

St. often abruptly changes the addressee: 149 *te* = Melior, 159 *tibi* = Glaucias, I 3, 59 *te* = Nais, *tibi* = Vopiscus, I 4, 6 *tuum* = Domitian, 10 *tuum* = Gallicus, V 5, 52 *tua* = the boy, 58 *quisnam rependis* = someone.

In a similar fashion apostrophe may be very sudden: 98, 138, 159, I 3, 24, I 6, 96, II 4, 32 (with Vollmer's note), II 5, 16, V 1, 127, V 2, 96, V 3, 78, *Th.* I 165, 582, 665.

To add to those difficulties, St. rarely mentions someone by name (one reason for which Markland's *Melior* for *hilaris* in 56 is not good), to

[25] The Concordance has put two forms of *honorus* under *honos*: *Th.* IV 624 and *Ach.* I 285.

create a special effect when he does so. This happens generally at the beginning or in the epilogue of his poem, see 102-5n., 229n., II 2, 147n., Fr. III 2, 48 *app. crit.*, Håk. 42-4.

These obscurities remind us of Propertius, e.g. Prop. III 7, 1-10 *tu* = *pecunia*, 11 *tua* = Paetus. For his abrupt changes of second to third person see Boucher 378.

The transition from Glaucias to Melior has been made easier because Glaucias only is the addressee by implication since vs. 38, also by *domini* 51.

54-5.: The implication of these and other interjected laments (67-8, 120 ff., 138-9) is that neither Glaucias' beauty nor his other advantages could save him from death, see E.-F. 137 § 28 with many parallels.

The formula 'all taken away at once' occurs also at Lucr. III 898 *omnia ademit una dies*, Verg. *A.* XI 28, *CE* I 405 *abstulit una dies animam, CIL* X 2483 *apstulit...unus tot tantaque munera dies.*

cineres: The poetic plur. (κονίαι, ψάμαθοι) is found since Vergil: Schink 40-1. In Vergil and esp. Ovid it has a clear preponderance over *cinerem* (in Hor. and Prop. somewhat less so), because it makes elision unnecessary: Maas 515-9, Neue-W. I 618. In St. the difference is very slight: *cinerem* 10, *cineres* 12.

intulit: *Inferre* in this sense is rare: 'to bring (into a state or condition), reduce to', *OLD* 10, see Pl. *Truc.* 573 *in pauperiem* -. Also V 5, 18-9 *quisquis...immersit cineri iuvenem, Th.* IV 673, VII 23 *cineri dare*, VI 169-71 - *reddere*, XII 82 - *impellere*, III 184 *concedere in cinerem.*

gravis hora: = *hostilis dies*, with characteristic repetition. *Hora* = *hora mortis*, see *TLL* VI^3 2963, 30 ff. *Gravis* occurs also at *CE* 899, 4 and 1314, 3. *Dies* for one special (unlucky) day: II 6, 12 with note, V 2, 88 *excidat ille dies aevo.*

56-66.: The section on Glaucias' beauty was punctuated by *o* and *heu*. The description of his behaviour, which follows now, is linked by insistent *quis*: 56, 57, 58, 60, 62, 65. This implies that Glaucias cannot be replaced (see 230-4n.) and that by his death Melior's whole life is changed.

The leading paradox is that Glaucias is praised for thwarting and annulling all Melior's actions: *curas remittere, tumentem lenire, dapes auferre, cuncta turbare, somnos abrumpere, abitus morari, revocare.* Thus the relationship master-slave is inverted. Thus, for instance, *hilaris* (56) is used for Melior himself, drawn as a philosopher, in II 3, 64-71, and also in 168 here. In this section his (negative) passions are stressed, as a foil for Glaucias' virtues. Contrast II 6, 52, where the boy is *tecum tristisque hilarisque.*

The explicit lament of 67-8 summarizes Glaucias' activities: speech: *muta, silentia/ colloquiis* 56, *murmure* 62, *revocare* 64 (for this theme in inscriptions, see Vérilhac II §§ 70, 94), and ubiquitous presence: *desolati/* eating 60-1, in bed 62-3, at the door 64-6.

56-7. colloquiis amatis: 'The conversations which you love'. Almost 'of your loved one', *cf.* I 2, 94-5 *amatos thalamos*: those of your beloved Violentilla, *Th.* VII 156, VIII 650.

For *amatis* some conjectures were made (van Dam 381) by critics not appreciating the abrupt *tua*, see 53n. See 226 *dulcibus alloquiis.*

hilaris: One of Sts.' favourite words: 33 times (32), 13 in the *Silvae.* Not in Verg., Prop., Tib., Pers., VFl., once in Luc. and Sil., 4 times in Ovid.

Markl. thought *-is -is* cacophonous, but *cf.* 168, II 6, 52, *Ach.* I 559, *Th.* XII 522 *emeritis hilaris tuba nuntiat armis.*

mulcebit: 230, *Th.* I 478 *mulcentem dictis corda aspera, Ach.* I 182 *pectora mulcens*, 274-5.

curas...arcana remittet: *Remittere* with *curas* is common, a metaphor taken from relaxing a bow. *Arcana mentis* together with *curas* is 'the secret sorrows of your mind'. This seems confirmed by Luc. VIII 279-80, echoed here, *ast ego* **curarum** *vobis* **arcana** *mearum/ expromam* **mentisque** *meae quo pondera vergant*, see Sil. XIV 188 *arcana...cura.*

58-9. ferat: M. *Fera*, Markland, is universally accepted: a subjunctive would be very strange amidst the future tenses, and *fera* is on one line with *ardenti.* Markland's argument, though, was that, if a verb were required, it must be something like *lenire*, for his ms. read *feret* (like Q). *Bilis fera* is unparalleled in Latin (*TLL* II 1988, 14 ff.), but *cf.* Hom. *Il.* IV 23, *al.*, χόλος ἄγριος.

tumentem: AKQ[1]U, *timentem*: M, *timendum*: mB printed only by Saenger, *tumentes*: an unknown ms. used by Domitius (van Dam 381). *Timendos* and *tumendos* are also confused at *Th.* I 174. *Tumentem*, of course, is right here. It is influenced by Hor. *Carm.* I 13, 3-4 *fervens difficili bile tumet iecur* and Pers. 2, 12-3 *acri bile tumet.*

St. often uses *tumere* and its derivatives for being angry, anger: II 5, 13, *Th.* III 333, *Ach.* I 155, see Heuvel on *Th.* I 299, Brinkgreve on *Ach.* I 155. The dative with it is found at *Th.* XI 378, *cf.* *intumescere* + dat. in Ov. *Pont.* IV 4, 34, following the construction of *irasci* with a dat.

bile: According to ancient belief, the bile swells and seethes (*ardenti*, continuing the trite metaphor of *accensum*) with anger: Hor. *Epod.* 11, 15-6 *inaestuet praecordiis...bilis, S.* I 5, 144 *bilis intumuit*, Pers. 3, 8, Mart. VI 64, 24 *si...bilis inusserit*, Rut. Nam. I 448-9 with Doblhofer's note, *cf.* Nisbet-H. on Hor. *Carm.* I 13, 3-4.

The word *bilis* seems to have a prosaic flavour: it occurs nowhere else in St., not at all in Verg., Prop., Ov., Sen. trag., Luc., VFl., Sil., but is frequent in satire and prose. Horace's attempt to introduce it into poetry met with as little success as in the case of *stomachus* (*Carm.* I 6, 6).

famulis: Glaucias himself is never called *famulus* (*Intr.*). In this way he is set apart here from the 'real' slaves.

deflectet in se: Turns your attention to himself and his *hilaritas*, so that you become *lenis* too. See Quint. *Inst.* VI 3, 87 *intellectus...ab asperioribus ad leniora deflectitur.*

60-1.: Eating from the same plates or out of each other's mouth, and drinking out of the same glass are normal pleasantries of lovers: Ov. *Am.* I 4, 31-4, *Ars* I 575-8, *Ep.* 16, 79, Sen. *Frg.* 83 Haase, Apul. *Met.* II 16, *AP* V 171 (Meleager), E. Rohde 175 n. 3.

Note how on the one hand St. stresses the intimate relationship between Glaucias and Melior (51, *amatis* 56, 62-66, 71, 105 *amabas*, 149-53, 200, 207 *amorem*, 228-9), and on the other hand the *pudor* and *verecundia* of the boy (*tit.* n., 39-40n., 72-5, 103, 136, 196-7).

dapes: The nom. sing. is extremely rare, the acc. sing. less so, but the plur. is much more usual. Poetic plur. since Verg. *Ecl.* 5, 79: Schink 47-8.

About the same goes for *vina*: the nom./ acc. sing. tends to disappear from poetry (perhaps because these words were originally feminine collective nouns: Löfstedt 1942² 48-9). Catul. exclusively, Hor. and Ov. sometimes, write *vinum.* Lucr., Verg., Tib., Prop., like St., exclusively use *vina*: Schink 136-7, Bednara 551, Neue-W. I 748.

dulci rapina: The comic situation of the slave robbing his master is here given a positive turn. St. loves *oxymora* with *dulcis* (see 14-5n., 45-6n.): - *cura* 72, II 6, 15, II 7, 37, 134, IV 5, 18 - *adultero*, IV 5, 25 -*periculum*, IV 8, 15 - *tumultu, Th.* I 68 - *furias*, V 162 - *nefas*, VII 165 -*pondus*, VIII 362 - *ponto* (see *Silv.* II 2, 18-9), IX 18 - *tabo*, 724 - *lituos belli*, XI 621 - *tenebras*, XII 639 - *ferro, Ach.* I 938 - *furta dolique.*

turbabit: 'Confound (the whole table)', see *Th.* VIII 258 *turbata feris pocula pinnis* (*Harpyiarum*), X 649, *Ach.* I 838, VFl. IV 454 *diripiunt...dapes foedataque turbant/ pocula.*

ira...vina...rapina: For the rhyme, though with different quantity, see 69-72n.

62-3. matutinos: The word occurs only here in St. *Matutinus somnus* also at Plin. *Nat.* XXVI 110, Mart. XIV 125, 1. The word suggests that Glaucias did not pass the night with Melior, see *tit.* n.

abrumpere: Verg. *G.* III 530 *nec somnos abrumpit cura salubris.*

impositus: The boy comes into Melior's bed. Conjectures like Schrader's *impositi* and Waller's *imposito* (14-5) restate the obvious fact that Melior slept in a bed, and do away with the detail that Glaucias joins him.

murmure: 104-5n.

64-6.: Glaucias tried to keep Melior from leaving by embracing him, calling him back for more kisses when he already was at the doorstep. And at his return he leapt into Melior's arms again and hugged him.

nexibus: 'Embrace', like Col. X 208, Sen. *Phoen.* 60. St. uses *nexus* in connection with the kiss of death at II 6, 78, see *Th.* XI 624 (both connotations), see Håk. 80-1.

atque ipsos revocabit ad oscula postes: Thus M. The only editor to retain this text is Vollmer, explaining *revocabit* as 'repeat' (*wiederholen*), an improbable interpretation, see III 3, 151 *hunc siquidem amplexu semper revocante tenebas* (a refutation of Vollmer's explanation rather than a parallel, as he claims). This text, moreover, involves taking *ad* not with *oscula*, but with *postes*. This is well-nigh impossible, see V 5, 83-4 *ad oscula nostra* (same metrical position)/ *erexi*, III 1, 179, *Th.* VII 194, IX 330, Housman on Man. I 245, van Dam 381-2 for a detailed discussion (adding *Th.* VII 519 *ad* **vestrum** *gemitus nunc verto* **pudorem**[26]). *TLL* I 473, 27, influenced by Vollm., retains M's text and puts *ad* under '*liberius ponitur*'. See also II 5, 27-30n., II 6, 30-3n.

Politian's *adque* is accepted by Fr., Merrill 87, Sb. But the repetition of the preposition with two different complements (one concrete, one abstract) seems strange.

I prefer *atque ipso...poste* (:σ; Kl., Postg., Mozl., Mar., Traglia). A scribe unfamiliar with the difference between *atque* and *adque* may have introduced the accusative. For the singular *postis*, see I 2, 237 *poste reclinis*, IV 1, 44 *clauso...poste, Th.* VIII 10, Hor. *Epod.* 11, 21, Luc. V 531 *poste recluso.*

ora manusque: The same ending occurs at *Ach.* I 339, *Th.* II 566, *cf.* I 2, 62/*ore manusque.* It refers back (*rursus* is *apo koinou* with *intranti* and *ora manusque*) to *oscula* and *nexibus* respectively.

prosiliet: All forms of this verb (10) occur only at the beginning of the verse in St. The reason for this is not metrical, because both forms where *ictus* and accent coincide (*prosilit*) and forms where they conflict (*prosiliet, prosiliunt*) take this position. The reason rather is a semantic one: the

---

[26] It may also be added that the conjecture *aque* (Bernaertius) was probably forestalled by Petrus Marsus in the 15th cent. (as *absque*), see Reeve 219.

surprising meaning of *prosilire* (and *insilire*, 3 times) prompts it to occupy the first place in the vs.[27].

This development seems to be post-Ovidian: In Hor. (hexam.), Prop., Tib., Verg. *prosilire* and *insilire* are very rare—and as often begin the verse as not. In Ovid there are 17 occurrences, in 8 of which they are not the first word. In Flavian epic there is a clear tendency to put forms of these verbs first in the verse, but the only poet to be as strict as St. is Lucan (8 times. VFl. 15 of which 3 not first, Sil. 3 and 2).

brevibus umeros circumdabit ulnis: III 1, 90 *blandis complectitur ulnis*/, V 3, 266 *vacuis circumdedit ulnis, Ach.* I 172 *avidis circumligat ulnis*, 196.

67-9. Muta domus: *Th.* IX 657-8 *lugentia antra...mutasque domos*, V 1, 19 *nigra domus*. For the *topos*, see II 4, 11-5, II 5, 11-2.

fateor: Attacked by many critics, because, as Markland put it, '*Stati, quid ad rem est sive tu hoc fatearis, sive non fatearis*'. Others have retorted that *fateor* here means hardly more than '*profecto*', 'alas' (Skutsch & Vollmer 828, Vollm., Fr. *app., TLL* VI[1] 337, 10). Parallels for this weakened sense are rare (one wonders if Gregorius Turonensis, quoted by Fr., is much to the point): in Ov. *Met.* IX 362 *et, fateor, volui sub eodem cortice condi* and *Tr.* II 469 *fateor* seems to have lost its meaning of 'concede' or 'profess'. In *Silv.* III 4, 39, *Ach.* I 775, it rather means 'to avow', *cf.* Calp. *Ecl.* 2, 28 and 5, 40, Mart. XIII 103, 1. The rest of the many parallels adduced by its defenders are of small use (see, however, Verg. *A.* II 134 with Austin's note).

Nevertheless I accept *fateor*, since its use in parentheses is common (*TLL* VI[1] 336, 70 ff.), and since no one has offered a satisfying emendation (*pariter*: Markland, *stat ero*: Baehrens, *fertur*: Otto 1887, 531, *fato en*: Waller 16-8, *Melior*: Polster 1878, 4, *iam adeo*: Sandstroem 18, *Statio* (!): Unger, *squalor*: Saenger, *mussat*: Housman 1906, 40).

situs: 'Lying down', thence 'rust' (Tib. I 10, 50 with Smith's note, see *Silv.* I 1, 70). 'The mouldering decay of long neglect' (Austin on Verg. *A.* VI 462) here, like I *Praef.* 26, II 3, 76, *al.*

thalamis: The poetic plur. occurs since Verg. (*A.* VI 94), often in Ovid: Schink 131-2, Bednara 540. St. has only one *thalamum* (*Th.* VII 602) against 16 *thalamos*, and 8 *thalamo*/ 19 *thalamis* (also before consonants).

silentia: Poet. plur. since Lucr. Exclusively plural in St., who, like Verg. and Ov., only uses this word in the 5th foot: Schink 118-9, Bed-

[27] This is an extra argument against accepting *prosilit* in *Th.* IV 609 (N) against *prolicit ultro*/ (ω).

nara 541. St. may allude here to the silence of the Underworld reigning in the house: *situs*, 204 *mutas* (n.), II 6, 100 *silentia Lethes.*

69-72.: A transitional passage: Vss. 70-1 summarize Glaucias' part in Melior's life. The reference to *funus* combines the laments in 54-5 and 67-8, and points forward to 157 ff., esp. 162-3. *Honorat* points forward to the praise of Melior in 72 ff., esp. 102-5 and 128-36. The formula *quid mirum* is an apt way to introduce another topic, *cf.* 175, V 1, 43 *nec mirum*, 82, V 2, 15, V 3, 162, *Th.* II 265.

pius altor...domino: Point forward to the reference to Glaucias' status between slave and free in 76 ff., see *Intr.* Note the paradox in *pius altor* (96 *altricum pietate*): *pius* is used for parents/ children in 32, III 3, 7, V 3, 218. (*Plus*: M, *pius*: Q).

portus: For a person, a 'refuge', at Ov. *Pont.* II 8, 68, Sen. *Her.F.* 1072, see *Th.* III 295 (Venus) *o mihi bellorum requies*, IV 536 (Manto) *o nostrae regimen viresque senectae.* The parallels suggest, like II 3, 74 (n.), that Melior already is *senex.*

deliciae: Like *cura* and *dulcis* forms part of the erotic vocabulary (42n., 60-1n.). For its possible technical implications see *tit.* n. See also Mart. XI 13, 3-4 *Urbis deliciae salesque Nili* (73 below),/ *ars et gratia, lusus et voluptas* and, in a similar anaphorical catalogue, Mart. V 24, 1 *saeculi voluptas*, 9-10 *divitiae locariorum...cura laborque ludiarum*, see Versnel 1977, esp. 377 ff., II 4, 1n.

curae: Neither St., nor other authors, use the plural of *cura* in the sense 'object of love': Vollm., *TLL* IV 1475, 42-60. The sing. is frequent in this meaning. Moreover, the rhyme in 70-3 *senectae, deliciae, curae, barbaricae, catastae* is very heavy indeed. In the second book there are only two other instances of three successive verses ending on the same sound: II 1, 59-61 and 171-3. The last of those has one extra rhyme within the verse. Five rhyming sounds are not found elsewhere. See also II 2, 68-9n. *ora* and II 6, 79-80n.

These two reasons seem to me to have enough weight for accepting Elter's (*ap.* Vollm.) *dulcis...cura.* Frère's explanation of the unusual plural by analogy to *deliciae* seems insufficient. The only editor to agree with Elter is Vollm.

Similar endings: V 1, 77, *Th.* II 338, VIII 606, XII 514, Verg. *A.* I 227, Luc. I 272, III 52, VIII 161, VFl. V 281, Sil. IV 92, Claud. *VICons.Hon.* 147.

72-105. Ortus and genus: In four steps St. leads us to a climax: **1)** The boy was not bought (72-5), **2)** He was a slave born in the house (76-7), **3)** His parents were liberated by Melior (77-8), **4)** His master thought of him as of a son (78-81, 102-5). This last, and most important, thought

frames the proposition which it provokes: foster-parents can have a deeper relationship with their adoptive children than their real parents (see *Intr.*, 23n.). St. states this explicitly in 82-7 and demonstrates the truth of it in an elaborate mythological comparison (88-102).

Some remarks on Glaucias' status must be made here: that his master had freed him is clear from Mart. VI 28, 1 *libertus Melioris ille notus* and VI 29, 4 *Glaucia libertus...Melioris*. His parents had been manumitted by Melior (77-8). If this was done before the birth of Glaucias, he would have been free, not a freedman. That his freedom was dependent on his parents' manumission (Fr. 58 n. 3), is an unnecessary supposition, and he would hardly have been called *verna* and *libertus* himself, in that case.

So Glaucias was freed in his own right. There were four ways to free a slave: by testament (*testamento*), by inscribing him on the census-list when a census was held (*censu*), by a public declaration before the praetor (*vindicta apud praetorem*), and informally (*manumissio inter vivos*): Duff 21-35, Watson 185 ff., 197, Kaser I 294-6. In the case of Glaucias the first two are excluded (no instance of *censu* is known in imperial times). The third, possibly used for his parents, is less probable than the fourth. This means that the master before some friends had declared that the slave was free, and that he did not have to work. This method was very popular in the whole of Roman history, because it probably was not liable to the 5% tax on manumission (Duff. *loc. cit.*). The procedure in these cases of informal manumission was not subject to strict or consistent rules: *Dig.* 40.5.24.10 *Nec enim ignotum est quod multa contra iuris rigorem pro libertate sint constituta*, see Buckland 548 ff., 715.

Mozley (p. 82 n.*b.*), and, perhaps, Vollm. claim that Glaucias was adopted by Melior. This cannot be true: the only ground for this contention can be *sustulit* (79). It is true that fathers lifted up their new-born children, thereby acknowledging their responsibility for them; but *tollere liberos* has no legal importance (Watson 82, Kaser I 345). Moreover, since Glaucias was born a slave he automatically fell under Melior's *patria potestas* and could not be adopted (Kaser I 284, Watson 77 ff., 90).

Thus there is no positive evidence in favour of a formal adoption, and all probability is against it: St. would certainly have spoken about it, and neither he, nor Martial, could have referred to (played on, in Sts.' case) master/ father, slave/ son (*Intr.*; for a joke on a similar theme: Mart. I 81). The comparisons in 87 ff. do not illustrate adoption, they show how those responsible for a child's upbringing often love it more than its parents do.

Melior thus has freed the child and taken the responsibility for its upbringing and education upon himself (106-19, 127-35), symbolized in *sustulit*, without being legally involved. The situation is exactly the same

as that of St. himself and his favourite slave V 5, 73-4 *libertatemque sub ipsis/ uberibus tibi, parve, dedi*, in combination with V 5, 10 *nec qui mea nomina ferret. Cf. ILS* 8554: *d m A Furius Crassus A Furius* (sic) *Festi ver(na) loco f(ilii) hab(itus) es(t) vix an IIII m VI d XXVIIII.*

72-5.: You were not a bought (72) impudent Egyptian (73-5) slave. For lack of high birth St. defends Glaucias' birth with the argument that he is born in the house, not bought on the market. See V 5, 66-9 *Non ego mercatus Pharia de puppe loquaces/ delicias doctumque sui convicia Nili/ infantem, lingua nimium salisbusque protervum.* The *defensio generis* occurs also at II 6, 21-33, III 3, 43-60, see E.-F. 131 § 11B. The *verna* is preferred as a house-slave also at Hor. *Ep.* II 1, 6, Mart. X 76.

Likewise Mart. VI 29, 1 has *verna* emphatically in the first verse: *Non de plebe domus nec avarae verna catastae.* Studies on the relationship between St. and Mart.: *SG* III[10] 290-6, Heuvel 299-330, Martin, Szelest 1963, Delarue 1974 (Latomus), White 1973, *cf.* Vollm. 20, Fr. XXI-XXV, Barwick. That the two poets in their poems ignore each other on purpose (rather than being open enemies) is clear. Studies tend to concentrate on biographic and chronological aspects (Heuvel least of them) more than on reciprocal influence. The general opinion seems to be that most parallels arise from a similar situation and literary training (see *Intr.*); but this verse suggests to me rather that one poet forestalled the other, though I am not able to say who was first. More work needs to be done in this field, see also II 6, 43-5n.

versabat turbo catastae: The *catasta* (either from κατά + *stare* or κατάστασις: Ernout-Meillet *s.v.* and *TLL*, or from καταστάτη (σκήνη): Walde Hofmann) was a platform where slaves were sold: since Tib. II 3, 59-60 *quem saepe coegit/ barbara gypsatos ferre catasta pedes*, Liv. XXVIII 21, 2, Pers. 6, 77, Plin. *Nat.* XXXV 200, Mart. VI 29, 1 (above), IX 59, 5, X 76, 2, Suet. *Gram.* 13. It is called *machina* at Q.Cic. *Pet.* 2, 8 and Petr. 74, 13.

From *versabat* and *turbo* commentators conclude that this platform could revolve: Vollm., Mozley, Fr. Others reject this interpretation: Mau 1899, 1785-6, Daremberg-Saglio I 698. This verse is the only evidence for a revolving stage. One wonders what use such a contraption could possibly have had: nothing seems easier than to order a slave to turn around, instead of building an elaborate machine. Nor can one imagine prospective buyers turning the *catasta* so as to have their favourite slave in front of them.

The alternative, however, is to explain *turbo* as 'turmoil', like Ov. *Am.* II 9, 28, III 15, 6 *non modo militiae turbine factus eques, Met.* VII 614, Sil. XI 101 *Gradivi turbine*, Claud. *Cons.Stil.III* 200-1 *denso...turbine vulgi circum-*

fusa rostra. Then *versabat* must mean 'thrusting him to and fro' (rather than Markland's 'jump and dance'). Both are possible, but taken together this seems not the most obvious interpretation. I can not decide in favour of either of the two possibilities. I think that St. especially imitates Tib. II 3, 59-60 (also *barbaricae*) and maybe, in a kind of unconscious reminiscence (*cf.* 47-8n.), Tib. I 5, 3-4 *agor ut...turben* (*turbo*: A), *quam...versat puer.* It is not clear, however, how this affects (if at all) the interpretation of this verse.

barbaricae: Selling of slaves is naturally associated with foreigners (Tib. *loc. cit.*, Mart. X 76). *Barbaricus* 'where barbarians are sold'. For this use, 'of actions, events, done by, or involving, foreigners' (*OLD* 1b): Verg. *Cat.* 9, 5 *barbaricae...pugnae,* Sen. *Thy.* 664, Sil. X 224, *cf.* Ov. *Ep.* 1, 26 *barbara praeda* 'booty taken from barbarians'. Here the word is used to contrast Glaucias more sharply with bought slaves, *cf.* III 3, 59 *neque barbaricis...ab oris.*

Phariis...mercibus: 'Egyptian stuff'. *Pharius* is Sts.' favourite synecdoche for Egyptian (161, II 5, 29, II 6, 87, V 5, 66 above, *al.*). Less often *Mareotis/ -icus* (e.g. III 2, 24) and *Niliacus* (IV 9, 12): Lunderstedt 30. First in Tib. I 3, 32. For Sts.' geographical adjectives, see II 2, 85-9n.

merx for people is strongly abusive: Afric. *Dig.* 50.16.20.7 *mercis appellatione homines non contineri Mela ait. TLL* VIII 851, 32 ff. gives only two instances of it: Pl. *Per.* 586 and Cic. *Ver.* II 5, 146, both less strong than this vs. It is reinforced by *venalis. Mixtus* also illustrates the 'mixed' sequence of words ABABA.

Egyptian slaves were notoriously insolent and talkative: apart from St., see also Quint. *Inst.* I 2, 7, W. J. Slater 123 ff., *tit.* n. However, some people also appreciated such quick-witted boys, see Sen. *Dial.* II 11, 3, Dio XLVIII 44, 3, LXVII 15.

compositos...sales meditataque verba: 'Studied jests and well-conned speeches' (Mozl.), *cf.* Liv. XL 15, 12 *tempus ad meditandum et componendam orationem.* For this use of *meditare,* see II 4, 7, Catul. 62, 12.

quaesisti...parasti: 'You looked for a master and yet slowly could win one'. St. heaps up negative expressions, later contrasting them: *barbaricae/ hic, penatibus*; *venalis/ liber*; *tarde/ protinus.*

76-8. Hic...hinc: *Hic* is Krohn's conjecture (*ap.* Vollm.) for M's *hinc.* (But it was forestalled by the 15th century humanist Pomponius Laetus, see Reeve 217-8). It is accepted by all edd.; *hinc* is vainly defended by Merrill 87. For details see van Dam 382.

Vollm. concludes from *hic...hinc* that St. '*fingiert dass er im Hause des Adressaten stehe*', and Marastoni (1958, 21) even regards it as proof that St. recited his poems. But then we would be forced to assume that in

front of Melior's house a pyre was smouldering (1-3), while St. with reversed lyre, steadily beating his breast, is singing (27-8).

St. feigns a direct poetic talk to Melior, with asides to the dead boy. He can very well use *hic* without implying that he is in Melior's house, *cf.* III 3, 196 *hic...hic intra tecta,* while the speaker is at the funeral, not in the house. See 2n.

ortus: See V 5, 73 *alios ortus libertatemque. Olim* goes only with *carus,* not with *liber,* see 72-105n. The juxtaposition *domini/ liber* is pointed, *cf.* Mart. I 81. *Penatibus*: 67.

gaudia: Always in the plur. in dactylic poetry: Bednara 544, Löfstedt 1942², 47.

quererere: QmBU for M's *querere.* See 48-9n.

78-81.: Atedius is very eager to appropriate the baby: *raptum, protinus, exultans, prima voce,* 102-5. His behaviour is paralleled by that of St. himself in V 5, 69 ff.

raptum...alvo: '*Geschmacklos*' according to Vollm. But *raptum* is an apt word in this context: *eripere* is used for the premature births of Asclepius and Bacchus at Ov. *Met.* II 639 *sed natum flammis uteroque parentis eripuit* (see Bömer's note), III 310-1 *infans...ab alvo eripitur.* Melior is so eager to lift the child that he can not wait until it has been completely born. See also Marastoni 1959, 446.

A similar action is performed by Venus in I 2, 109 ff. *tellure cadentem excepi fovique sinu nec colla genasque comere...cessavit manus.* Melior is cruelly aped by Invidia in 121-3.

raptum sed: Phill. puts a full stop after *raptum.* Merrill (88) defends this with 'the boy would not complain of birth taken away from him when he had never had it', which I do not understand.

The postposition of *sed* and other connecting particles is a 'neoteric mannerism' (Austin on Verg. *A.* I 333), not uncommon since Augustan times in poetry. It is chiefly for metrical convenience; sometimes it serves to highlight certain words. It is not very frequent in *Silv.* II: only here and II 7, 126. In the Aeneid 10 instances are found, and one of *sed* in third position (V 5). For a complete list of *nam(que), at, sed, aut, iamque* in second position in Vergil: Norden 1912² *Anhang* III (with instances from Hor., Prop., Tib. and others). General literature: *LHSz.* 488, Marouzeau 1949, 89 ff., Kühner-St. II 2, 615 n. 21, Williams on Verg. *A.* V 5. See also *CE* 727, 9 *occurrat sed...*, 1814, 6 *invida sed rapuit...*, II 6, 91n.

For postposition of *et,* see II 2, 81-2n., for postposition of *quod* and *nec,* see II 6, 91-2n.

protinus: many things are said to happen directly following birth: I 2, 73, II 7, 36, IV 5, 37, IV 8, 36, V 3, 121, V 5, 80, *cf.* V 2, 32, V 3, 134, Tert. *An.* 19, 7 *statim infans, ut vitam vagitu salutavit.*

astra salutantem: In English 'to see the light' St. speaks of seeing the stars, also at V 3, 211-3 *mihi sidera...dedisti*, I 4, 3 *dubitata sidera cernit*, see Juv. 7, 194-6 *Distat enim quae/ sidera te excipiant modo primos incipientem/ edere vagitus et adhuc a matre rubentem*, Claud. *Laus Ser.* 47-8. Light (*lucida*) typifies life; thus dying persons search for the last ray of light: V 1, 174-5, *Th.* VIII 649-50, Pease on *A.* IV 692. See 169-72n. For *salutare*, see 38-9n.

sibi mente dicavit: *Dicare* is used for consecrating with a sacred bond, like a marriage: II 7, 82, Verg. *A.* I 73 = IV 126 *conubio iungam...propriamque dicabo*, VFl. III 535, *TLL* V[1] 966, 23 ff. Melior consecrates the boy to himself, which implies an opposition to ties of blood (*sanguis* 84).

genuisse putavit: IV 8, 13-4 *quaeque sibi genitos putat attollitque benigno/ Polla sinu*, Claud. *Laus Ser.* 106 *propius quam si genuisset amavit.*

82-6.: 'Without being blasphemous, I may say that other bonds may be tighter than natural ones'. For the thought: II 6, 18, V 5, 11-23, 72, 79, *Th.* VI 160-7.

Fas...dixisse: The perf. infin. without preterite sense after impersonal constructions occurs since Augustan poetry. It is an extension of the originally Latin use of the perf. infin. in prohibitions and legal terminology. After *licet* the most frequently occurring infin. is *dixisse*: Lease 20. When this possibility had been codified by use, its metrical advantages were exploited by the poets, e.g. V 3, 275-6 *fas...contingere...fas iunxisse*, Verg. *G.* III 435-6, Tib. I 1, 45-6, 73-4. *Fas est* + infin. perf.: V 3, 265, *Ach.* I 73. See *LHSz.* 351-2, Kühner-St. II 133 f., Williams on *Th.* X 251.

sanctorum...parentum: *Th.* I 539 *sanctum patrem*, III 3, 18 *sanctam patris canitiem*, Sall. *Iug.* 85, 40 *ex parente...et aliis sanctis viris*, - *parens* Juv. 7, 209, - *parentes* Apul. *Met.* IV 24. For other members of the family: Link 73. For other persons, and for *sacer, sancire, sanctus*: Fugier. The word refers to the sacred lien between kinsmen (Latte 39) rather than being simply a development of *venerandus* (thus Link) and fits the lofty tone of these verses.

Natura: 34n. It is remarkable that St. only calls upon Nature (vs. 34 excluded) when something unnatural is the case: here, V 5, 22, *Th.* XI 607 *vincis, Natura, parentem* (Oedipus, in spite of himself, cries for the death of his sons), *Th.* XII 561 (Creon refuses burial). This peculiarity is not found in other poets delighting in paradox, *cf.* Luc. IX 855, Sen. *Oed.* 25, *Phaed.* 959, 1116-7 *quanto parentes sanguinis vinclo tenes, Natura.*

Natura is relatively rare in poetry, and then by far most often used as a personification (120-4n.). One of its most frequent poetic meanings is 'natural sentiments', a meaning not connected with any of its uses in philosophy. This suggests that the word, unpoetical at first, comes into favour as a personification, and at the same time starts to lose its traditional meaning. In poetry it is generally impossible to attribute one sense to it rather than another: Pellicer 459-78, for 'natural sentiments': 475 with n. 4.

tuque oro...sinas: *Tuque*: M[1], *Oro*: M[2], *tu quoque ora*: M. *Oro* with subj. without *ut* is pre-literary. It is mainly found in everyday language and in poetry: *LHSz.* 529-30. St. prefers *oro* with an imperative (11 times) to the subj. (6). He uses both *ōrō* (I 5, 63 with Vollm., IV 8, 23, *al.*) and *ōrŏ* (III 4, 103, *Th.* VII 257, *al.*).

animis: QR for *animus*: M. These are the only variants mentioned by Saenger, Phill., Fr., Mar., Sb., Traglia. That something was wrong was seen by earlier commentators, but they generally attacked *sociare*, a conjecture introduced by Domitius: Polster 1884, 4, *cf.* Heinsius in Burmannus V 534. Only Barth conjectured *animo* (which I do not fully understand) and Krohn *atavis*.

Editors explain *animis* as 'between people', 'between soul and soul' (Mozl., Fr., Vollm., '*de l'affection*': Clouard). But in the *c.* 140 occurrences of *animus* in St. there is no instance of a similar abrupt use of *animus* for 'a person'. *Th.* I 559, IV 230, VI 738, XI 466, *Silv.* V 2, 87 seem nearest, but are still different.

It could be objected that 'soul and soul' can easily be inferred out of the context. But this is exactly the sense which is not required here. Melior is tied to Glaucias *mente, mente animoque* (103), not by bonds of kinship. This is exemplified by Vollmer's comment '*das natürliche Verwandtschaftsverhältnis bringt in der Regel für die Herzen einen Zug zu einander mit sich*'. The point, however, is that here the connection of hearts is separated from that of blood, and that Nature is addressed as the patroness of ties of blood, the *prima iura.*

I propose to read *hominum* for *animus*: if *iura hominum* was written as *iura ominu* (*sancire*), it could easily be corrupted into *iura animus.* See *Th.* III 689 *iura deum genialia.*

sanguis proximus...demissa propago: 'Not everything is connected by the blood that is nearest or the progeny descended by the family lineage'. *Sanguis proximus* refers to kinship in horizontal line: Val. Max. V 5 *proximus gradus* 'brotherly love'. The second expression refers to kinship in vertical line.

serie generis demissa: *Th.* III 286 *demissumque Iovis serie genus*, III 3, 44 *proavis demissum stemma.* Generally *demissus a*: Verg. *G.* III 35, Hor. *S.* II 5, 63. For *series*, see Fortgens on *Th.* VI 268.

serpunt: Underlines the metaphor in *propago*: for vineshoots and other plants: Cic. *Sen.* 15, 12 *vitis serpens*, Verg. *Ecl.* 8, 13 *inter victrices hederam tibi serpere lauros, OLD* 2b, *cf.* 101-2n.

adscita...pignora: St. has purposely chosen two words which can be explained both in a specific and in a vague sense, according to the context: *pignora* = children (II 6, 3, opposed to *famuli*; III 3, 121, *al.*), but also 'dear ones' (200, *al.*).

Adsciscere is a technical term for adopting: Tac. *Ann.* XV 19 (*cum*) *orbi...adoptionibus asciscerent filios*, see Vollm. on I 1, 23. But it can also be used in a more general sense: *OLD* 1 a, b, d, e. St. tends to use *adsciscere* only in a transferred sense: II 2, 136, V 3, 126, like IV 5, 39 *adoptatus*. On the one occasion when he explicitly mentions adoption, he does not use one of these obvious terms, but the vague *assertus*: I 1, 23 (see Mar. *app. crit.*).

conexis: As so often St. repeats himself, specifying meanwhile: *alligat/ conexis*.

Vollm. and Fr. explain *conexis* as a dative of advantage, '*dans les cœurs de ceux qui s'y sont attachés*'. Mozley translates as an abl. of comparison 'than our own kindred', which seems more natural.

Vollm. claims that *conexus* = 'related' does not exist without an addition like *genere*. But see Tac. *Ann.* II 50 (*Varilla*) *Caesaris conexa, TLL* IV 167, 78 ff. And also *Ann.* I 62, VI 7 *neque discerneres alios a coniunctis*; the absolute use of *cognatus*.

87-8.: The *sententia* closes the proposition, *cf.* Quint. *Inst.* VIII 5, 2 *lumina praecipueque in clausula posita sententias vocamus*, Cancik 1965, 23 ff. for many examples of St. closing a section with a pointed remark (*schlussbildende Pointen*). *Cf.* also II 2, 30-5n., 42-4n., 95-7n., 107-54n., II 6, 18-20n. Also 153-7n. (*qualis erat*).

The idea that adopting children is better than begetting them is old: Democr. 277B (DK), Isocr. I 10, Sall. *Iug.* 10, 3 and 8 *meliores liberos sumpsisse...quam genuisse.* A mass of arguments for this thesis was developed later, probably under the influence of imperial adoptions, e.g. Plin. *Pan.* 89 *contendis pulchrius fuerit genuisse talem an elegisse*, see Vollm., Lohrisch 119-20. Arguments to the contrary can, of course, also be found: *Th.* XI 35, Sen. *Con.* II 1, 13 *iam ne liberi quidem nisi alieni placent*, Curt. X 3, 13.

For a somewhat similar construction, see Luc. VI 494-5 *parere necesse est/ an iuvat.*

est: The first form of *esse* in this poem. St. rather avoids common words like *habere, ire, esse*, see 101-2n., II 4, 31-3n. In the *Epic. Drusi*, for example, *est* is in the 4th verse. But St. is not always so economical: *esse* in I 4, 4, II 2, 1 (a formula), II 6, 2, II 7, 5.

88-102.: A series of mythological *exempla*, one of the few moments in *Silv.* II where the mythological learning becomes rather excessive: less so in 140-5, otherwise only in 10-1 and 179-82 here. Mythology plays an important part in the *laudatio* of II 6: 21-57n. and 25-33n. there.

St. has often been reproached by critics for his use of mythology. Modern authors, however, have argued, rightly I think, that it is by no means mere ornament. Cancik (1965, esp. 9-12, 15, 28, nn. 16-7) has broken ground here, showing that mythology often has a closure-function (157-82n., II 2, 34-5n., 95-7n., 100-6n.), or operates as an independent layer of a poem (see also his index under *Mythologeme*). Szelest (1972, *Mythologie*) has pointed out how mythology is also a way to blend the human and the divine level, creating a half-way world, see also Newmyer 100, 104-5, 108, 116, Bright 17-8, II 3 *Intr.*, *Appendix.*

However true this is, the enumeration here is composed without much concern for *celare artem.* Some subtle associations can be discerned within the series, but the whole seems more mechanical than II 6, 25 ff., also because of the formula *quid referam* (218 *ut sileam*, Cancik 1965, 34).

Four foster-fathers are mentioned: Chiron (opposed to Peleus), Phoenix (Peleus), Acoetes (Euander), Dictys (Jupiter), one of 1 1/2 vs., three of 2 vss. Two foster-mothers are named: Ino (Semele), Acca (Ilia), 2 vss. each, separated from the fathers by the formulary vs. 96.

The 'rhyme', caused by the 5 imp. indic. forms, the persistent alliteration of *p* in 89-95, the metrical analogies in *vīncēbāt Pēlĕă Chīrōn/ cōmēbāt Pērsĕă Dīctȳs* and *hǣrēbăt ălūmnō/ spēctābăt Ăcœtēs*, the anaphora of *Peleus* (89, 90), and of *quid* (96, 97), create a parallelism.

The variety of construction counteracts this: *sic* with a verb, *nec/ sed,* asyndeton, *cum* with subj./ indic., a comparison, asyndeton again, confer an individuality on each pair of opposites.

For the climax here (72-105n.): 94-5n.

88-9. blandus ... semifer: 45n., 61-2n. Centaurs are called both *semifer* (*Th.* IX 220, *Ach.* I 868, Ov. *Met.* II 633, *al.*) and *semivir* (Ov. *Fast.* 380, not in St.). This sentence implies: 'Chiron, though only partly human, by his fond (and unexpected) behaviour proved better than Achilles' real father, who did not educate him, though both were Thessalians'. Peleus is called Thessalian in I 2, 215, Chiron in *Ach.* I 182-3, 196 (where Achilles prefers him to Thetis).

Haemonius: Thessalian, 9 times in St. *Thessalicus* 6 (7), *Thessalus* 2.

Achilli: No legend, except Heracles', is so frequently mentioned in the *Silvae* as that of Achilles: I 2, 216 ff., II 6, 30 ff. (n.), II 7, 96-7, III 4, 85, IV 4, 35-6, V 3, 191 ff., see Legras 1908, 34-5, Traglia 1972, 67 ff. During the publication of the *Silvae*, St. began to work on the Achilleid:

IV 7, 21 ff., V 2, 162 ff., Legras 1908, 34-7, Fr. XX. We may conclude that this subject, dear to literature and visual art alike (II 6, 30-3n.), had a special attraction for St.

vincebat: *pietate.* See II 6, 7, 85, V 5, 22.

90-1.: These two vss. are connected with the preceding ones by treating a second aspect of Achilles' life, the Trojan war. Achilles, Chiron and Peleus are also associated in V 3, 192-4, Phoenix is mentioned at III 2, 96, V 2, 151. For his influence on Achilles, see esp. Hom. *Il.* IX (168, 427, 432 ff.).

senior Peleus: = *Ach.* I 440. Markland conjectured *genitor.* But *natum* is opposed to *alumno* and *senior* refers back to *tenero* in 88: when Achilles was young, Peleus entrusted him to the care of Chiron, when he was adult (and Peleus was old), Phoenix accompanied him—though *senior* too. Similarly in 94-5 *genitor* is opposed to *Perseus,* not to *natum.*

Senior with a proper name: also in III 3, 77, *Th.* I 295, 542, *al.*, see Vollm. on I 1, 102.

arma: 'War': I 1, 18, IV 3, 134, *OLD* 6a.

claro: M, *caro*: σ, accepted by Baehrens, *cf.* Verg. *A.* XI 33 *comes...caro datus ibat alumno.* The two are interchanged also at I 2, 169, II 6, 99. But *clarus* can stand: it translates δῖος, see II 6, 14-5n.

haerebat: *Ach.* I 345-6 *comes haeret eunti mater, Th.* IX 808-10 *haerebat iuveni...Dorceus, cui...mater...pueri mandaverat annos.* It indicates the faithful companion who stays on his pupil's side.

92-3.: From the Trojan war to the Trojan's war in Italy, from Iliad to Aeneid. In both cases the father has entrusted his son to an old man (*A.* XI 30 ff. *Acoetes...senior...comes...datus...alumno,* 85 *aevo confectus*), never to see him again. *Non comitatus* is varied by *optabat reditus,* see *A.* XI 54 *hi nostri reditus exspectatique triumphi?*, 50 *fors et vota facit cumulatque altaria donis.*

longe: Opposed to *spectabat,* like *procul* (94) to *comebat.* Acoetes is depicted as looking at Pallas' battles. St. chooses his words with care: he tends to take a characteristic, (an aspect of) a concrete situation, rather than to present his *exempla* in the abstract: *comebat* (see below), *reptantem* (98), *portantem* (100), *cf.* 36-136n., 178-82n., II 6, 25-8n.

reditus[28]**:** The poetic plur. occurs since Verg. *A.* II 118.

94-5.: A climax: Even Jupiter (*genitor*) is surpassed by a foster-father, the humble fisherman Dictys. Similarly Ilia, the mother of the divine Romulus, is not so good a mother as the shepherd's wife Acca (99-100).

Ziehen (1896, *Epenzitate,* 313-7 and 1904, 655-6) puts forward the thesis that St. sometimes in his mythology quotes contemporary (lost)

[28] Here and II 6, 17 under *redire* in the Concordance.

epics. Thus here, 180, II 6, 25 ff. Unfortunately it is impossible to prove any of his contentions, see Vollm. on I 2, 109.

nitidis ab astris: repeats *procul.* 'On the stars': *Th.* XI 46-7 *trux maeret ab astris Amphitryoniades.* For *astra* as the abode of the gods: e.g. *Th.* XII 66, somewhat differently I 1, 98, IV 2, 10: *OLD* 4b.

Marastoni (1959, 446) compares IV 3, 156 *ultra sidera,* and explains both verses as 'Jupiter was with the Ethiopians'. But *ab* differs from *ultra,* and in IV 3 it is only the context which justifies this interpretation.

cessaret: 'To do nothing (when something is expected), to be remiss': *OLD* 3a, e.g. *Th.* II 601, IV 690, III 5, 69, see IV 4, 43, Hor. *Ep.* II 2, 14, Plin. *Nat.* XI 105.

fluctivagus: An innovation of St.: Schamberger 288 (Speranza 1956, 47 adds nothing new), *cf.* III 1, 84 *fluctivagus nauta, Th.* I 271, 499, IX 305, 360. But he continues a tradition beginning with Lucr. and Catul.: Catul. 63, 72 *nemorivagus,* Lucr. V 1191 *noctivagus* (4 times in St.), *fluctifragus* (id. I 305), *harenivagus* (Luc. IX 94), *fluentisonus* (Catul. 64, 52), *fluctisonus* (Sen. *Her. O.* 836), see *undisonus Ach.* I 198, 408.

St. likes compound adjectives: Williams on *Th.* X 158 and the literature there, Heuvel on *Th.* I 265, Deipser 217 ff., Arens, esp. 243, where it can be concluded that St. has more different adjectives in *-fer* than any other poet before him, except Ovid. They have a Greek flavour: Quint. *Inst.* I 6, 70.

volucer: Perseus' winged feet are often mentioned: *volucer*: *Th.* X 892, *pinnipes*: Catul. 58 b 2, *cf.* VFl. I 68. The adjective is ornamental, for when Perseus was saved, he was not yet winged.

comebat: One detail mentioned. *Comere* characterizes parental love, 'caressing': *Th.* IX 902, for a foster-parent *Ach.* I 182, *cf.* I 2, 110-1. It also means 'to adorn, to dress', esp. hair: I 2, 11, II 1, 122, *Th.* III 424 (without any association with love). I think that both aspects count here: St. exemplifies the education of the boy in the loving care spent on his appearance. Markland's angry conjecture *tollebat* ('*parum est ornare aliquem puerum nisi institutioni vel educationi curam simul impendas*') is superfluous.

96. Quid referam: Occurs in the *Silvae* at I 3, 64, I 5, 57, II 2, 63, V 3, 246. Not in the epics, where the poet keeps himself more in the background. These formulas (*an mirer, quid revolvam, quid dicam*) sometimes—not often—intervene in the *Silvae* as links and transitions, but St. more often makes use of points and *Mythologeme,* see Cancik 1965, 25-34, II 2 *Intr.* under **II**, 64n., *cf.* 50n. here.

parentes: 'Mothers', as made clear by *victas.*

97-8.: The idea from 94-5 (Jupiter's negligence) is continued: Jupiter did not take care of his son Perseus by Danae, nor of Bacchus by Semele,

whom, moreover, he killed by lightning (alluded to by *cineres*). Likewise Mars deserted Ilia (99-100).

post cineres deceptaque funera matris: 'After your deceived mother had died by lightning'. For *cineres...funera*: *Th.* IX 397 *cineres...supremaque iusta*, XII 149-50 *funus...cineremque. Decepta*: enallage, see *Th.* II 304-5 *decepta mariti/ arma, Silv.* IV 6, 56-7.

The brachylogy with temporal *post* is frequent. Originally colloquial, but also in literary language, e.g. *Th.* X 351 *post manes*, XII 497 *post busta*, Cic. *Ver.* I 46, Hor. *Carm.* II 7, 9, Ov. *Met.* XI 607, see *LHSz.* 243, 827.

The ending *funera matris*: *Th.* IX 634, *cf. Ach.* I 85, *Silv.* III 3, 136, Luehr 31.

The verse is imitated by Aus. *Cupido Cruc.* 16: *Fulmineos Semeles decepta puerpera partus.*

Conjectures are superfluous (*fulmina*: Markland, comparing *Th.* IX 425, *munera*: Klotz 1896, 74-5, *foedera*: Saenger, *despecta*: Lehanneur).

Inoo: Ino was Semele's sister, who educated Dionysus, see 178-82n. The key-words in Ovid's story of Ino are *matertera Bacchi* (*Met.* III 313, IV 417) and *alumnus* (IV 421, 524): Bömer on IV 416 ff. The adj. *Inous* occurs since Verg. *G.* I 437, 5 times in St., to avoid the gen. of *Ino* (*Inous, Inonis*, or *Inoos*: Neue-W. I 453, 456-7, 515-6).

reptare: Regular for the crawling of small children: IV 5, 34, IV 8, 29, V 5, 83[29], *Th.* IV 794, IX 620, 797, *Ach.* I 477, *cf. Ach.* II 96. *Pectore* is strange with it, since everywhere else *solo* is written or understood with it. But St. mainly wants to picture the child at Ino's breast, and *cf.* III 1, 177-8 *grexque protervus...umeris avi inreptet.* Claud. *Ruf.* I 93-4 imitates St.: *Parvus reptavit in isto...sinu.*

99-100.: 'Ilia, not thinking any more of the father of her child, reigned the Roman waters, when Romulus burdened Acca bearing him'. After Ilia had borne Romulus and Remus, she was thrown into the Tiber by her jealous uncle Amulius. There she married the river-god, while her children, also thrown into the river, but in a vessel of some kind, were found and educated by Faustulus and Acca. This version: Hor. *Carm.* I 2, 17, Ov. *Fast.* II 598, followed by St. For different traditions see Fr. 59, 3n., Nisbet-H. on Hor. and Bömer on Ov. *Fast.* II 383. So even the founder of Rome was educated by a foster-mother.

secura: 'Without thinking of, caring for', like *Th.* VIII 268, IX 335, XII 235, *Ach.* I 233, 311, 684, Verg. *A.* I 350, X 326, Ov. *Tr.* I 1, 49, Tac. *Hist.* III 41. *Secura* (*cessaret* 94) is opposed to *lassaret portantem, regnabat* (*cf.* Ov. *Am.* III 6, 61 ff. *tibi regia nostra patebit*) to Acca's simplici-

[29] Not in the Concordance.

ty, *cf.* Ov. *Fast.* III 55 *non ego te, tantae nutrix Laurentia gentis, nec taceam vestras, Faustule pauper, opes.*

Parens, a conjecture by Domitius (accepted by Markl., Baehr., Clouard) and *se secura sati*, Courtney 1968, 52 ('indifferent to her son'), are too explicit.

Tuscis: Etruscan. Used for the Tiber also in IV 5, 39-40, *cf.* I 2, 190, IV 4, 5-6 *Lydius Thybris.*

101-2.: The series closes with a metaphor from the horticultural sphere, a rare subject in the *Silvae.* It refers back to the introduction of this series: *propago, serpunt* (85-6)/ *transertos, robore, ramos, cf.* 106-7, announcing the end 103-5, which restates the beginning of the pericope 78 ff.

The subject is one of didactic poetry, and this is underlined by *vidi ego* (21-2n.): Verg. *G.* II 32-3 *et saepe alterius ramos impune videmus/ vertere in alterius*, 80-2. St. is imitated (but in a contrary sense) by Prud. *Apoth.* 342. The opposite feeling also: St. Paul *Rom.* 11: 24 *Nam situ ex naturali excisus es oleastro, et contra naturam insertus es in bonam olivam: quanto magis ii, qui secundam naturam, inserentur suae olivae.*

transerere: 'To graft', introduced into poetry by St.: Schamberger 327, *cf.* 86 *adscitae* (n.). For the abl. with it, see *transferre* + abl. *Ach.* I 329 and Williams 1951 (CQ), 145-6.

ire: The first occurrence of *ire* in this poem, *cf.* 87-8n. It occurs 10 times in *Silv.* II. This is less than in Prop. I (13, somewhat shorter) and Ov. *Am.* I (18, somewhat longer), but more than in Tib. I (6 (+2), somewhat longer).

suis: 'Their own twigs', the branches of their original tree. Thus children educated by others than their own parents (*alieno robore*), like Glaucias, are the better for it.

102-5.: Sudden apostrophe of Melior: *te* is only intelligible through *patrem* (52-4n.). This brings us back to the main theme of the poem, see *Intr.*

St. often closes a section with apostrophe, generally touching on a main theme of the poem: 149-53, 206-7, II 2, 62, 70-2, 95-7, *cf.* 143-6, I 4, 34-6, III 1, 154-62, *al.* A related technique is that of the apostrophe at the end of the poem, which is rarely absent (52-4n.): 226 ff., II 2, 121 ff., II 3, 62 ff., *cf.* II 4, 32-3, II 5, 24-7, II 6, 103 ff., II 7, 120-2.

102-3.: 'And already your thoughts and your heart had made you a father to him, not yet his character or beauty'.

The boy's character (39-40, 56-66, 70-1) and his beauty (39-54) would have been enough to make Melior decide to be like a father to him; but even before these were apparent (*iam, tamen* 104), Melior's intelligence

and kindness (*cf.* 80, 84) had secured Glaucias a place. *Cf.* Mart. VI 29, 2-3 *domini sancto dignus amore puer/ munera dum posset nondum sentire patroni.*

104-5. vinctas...murmure voces: M's *vinctas* was changed in the ms. by Poggio (?) to *iunctas*, and many conjectures have been made afterwards, though modern scholars generally suppress them (van Dam 382-3). *Murmur* is a favourite word of St. and can be used in many different contexts, see Dilke on *Ach.* II 120, 146-7n., II 4, 3n.

Editors who accept *iunctas* (Vollm., Kl., Phill., Mozl., Sb.) adduce as a parallel *Th.* V 613-5 *verba ligatis/ imperfecta sonis risusque et murmura soli/ intellecta mihi.* They interpret *murmura* as 'halting speech, stammering of the young child' (*cf.* Luc. I 561), the sense it must bear in vs. 62. Vollmer explains '*Es laufen schon einige deutliche Worte hinunter, die also noch mit Stammeln verbunden sind*'.

Here, however, the context shows that *murmur* must mean the crying of the baby, who does not utter any words, like II 7, 37 *primo murmure dulce vagientem. Murmur* is 'unarticulated cries' at Ov. *Met.* X 702 *pro verbis murmura reddunt,* XIV 280-1 *pro verbis edere raucum murmur.* It might be contended that *infans* here has its literal meaning '(a baby) incapable of uttering words', *cf.* Lucr. V 1031 *infantia linguae* and Bailey's note, perhaps also in 125. It is used in the more vague sense 'child' in 73 and 177.

Therefore I prefer *vinctas* (after Saenger, Fr.—who, however, translates '*balbutiement*'—, Mar., Traglia): 'The words chained by crying'. That is to say that the words were never produced, only cries. *Voces vinctae* is, I think, a bold Statian *aemulatio* of expressions like *lingua vincta,* see Prop. III 5, 21, Ov. *Fast.* II 581 *linguas inimicaque vinximus ora, Ars* II 465-6 *columbae quarum blanditias verbaque murmur habet.*

For the thought: V 5, 80-1 *primo gemitum qui protinus ortu/ implicuit fixitque mihi.*

etiam nunc: 'Still', *Th.* VIII 574, Verg. *G.* IV 135.

rudis: 'Unarticulated', *Th.* II 391 *rudis fandi,* see II 7, 75.

106-24.: Glaucias' precocity (38-9n.), as shown in his looks (*vultu* 108) and demeanour (*gressu*), illustrated by his physical abilities (110-3) and intellectual capacities (113-9). It is preceded by the comparison to a flower (below), and ends with a lament (*plangimus* 124) about the envy of the gods (120-4). The vss. 124-5 are transitory, pointing back to the beginning of this section (*annis* 124/ *annos* 106-9), and pointing forward to Melior's generosity.

The stress lies on Greek culture: *Graius* 113, *Attica* 114, mythology, wrestling, declaiming of Greek authors, the Greek Muse (116) and the

Greek Fate (120). For the importance of Greek culture see II 2, 95n., II 6, 24-5n.

The *topos* in the background is 'the best die first', see II 7, 90-3n.

106-9.: The comparison of the (prematurely) deceased to a flower, especially a purple one, is ancient and common: Hom. *Il.* VIII 306-7 μήκων δ' ὡς ἑτέρωσε κάρη βάλεν, ἥ τ' ἐνὶ κήπῳ, καρπῷ βριθομένη νοτίῃσί τε εἰαρινῇσιν·, e.g. Catul. 11, 22, Verg. *A.* IX 435 ff., Ov. *Met.* X 190 ff., Vérilhac nrs. 27, 39-41, see Vollm. on III 3, 128, Fortgens on *Th.* VI 58, Smith on Tib. I 4, 29, Rutgers van der Loeff 41-3, 62-5, 89-93. For our vss., *cf.* III 3, 127 ff. **florentes***que manu scidit Atropos* **annos/** *qualia...pubentes...rosae* **primos** *moriuntur* **ad austros**, *aut ubi verna novis* **expirat** *purpura* **pratis**, and for the thought V 1, 146 ff.

Flowers and dead people are compared because of their fleeting beauty and sudden and early death. The flower becomes a symbol of mortality, *cf.* Plin. *Nat.* XXI 2 (a garden full of flowers) *magna admonitione hominum, quae spectatissime floreant celerrime marcescere.*

Pre-eminent in this connection is the rose, *rosea* 116, see many examples in Smith's note, e.g. Verg. *Ros. Nasc.* (= *Anth. Lat.* 646 R.) 49-50 *collige...rosas...et memor esto aevum sic properare tuum.* The thought occurs also in verse-inscriptions, see Vérilhac no. 178 (1st or 2nd cent. A.D.) περὶ σοῦ πάντα γένοιτο ῥόδα, *CE* 1040, 1-4 (Rome, 1st cent. A.D.?) *ac veluti formosa rosast cum tempore prodit, / arescit certo tempore deinde suo, / sic tu coepisti primo formossa, Anna, videri, / tempore sed subito desinis esse mea.* See Pikhaus 62 with n. 135. Roses were also worn and thrown upon the dead at burials, see *AP* IX 19, 3-4, Bion *Adon.* 75. In the first-century testament of Epikrates, preserved on stone, the author orders two of his freedman to deck the grave of his long dead son with roses for his cult, fixing a minimum cost for these roses, see P. Hermann 1. 48 and p. 30. From the first century A.D. onward (Plin. *Nat.* XXI 11, *CIL* X 444) the *Rosalia*, a festival of the dead, are attested, see Latte 363.

alte: Explains *improbus* (2n.), and together with it and *exstare* refers to the premature growth. *Primos* and *mollibus* heighten the pathos.

exspirare: For flowers or *sim.*: III 3, 130, *Th.* IX 596-7, XII 658, *cf.* V 2, 70. *Efflat* for Glaucias in 150.

tener: Opposed to *improbus*, and appropriate both for the boy (40, 88, *cf.* II 6, 23, 49, II 7, 54, *Th.* VI 121) and for flowers (I 5, 16, *Th.* IV 702, VI 54). The metaphors from the vegetative world return in *adultum* 122, *assurgens* 125. *Ante diem*, prematurely (I 2, 176), goes closely with *vultu gressuque superbo.*

superbus: *In bonam partem* here, like II 7, 116, V 2, 166, *cf.* Mulder on *Th.* II 223, Håk. 64-5 and II 2, 133-9n. It is *apo koinou* with *vultu* and *gressu.*

vicerat aequales: For superiority over other boys of the same age, see Vérilhac nrs. 60, 61 ὅς παίδων πάντων ἡγήσατο.

reliquerat annos: 38-9n. In inscriptions: *CE* 649, 5, 7, *praeclarus studiis, ultra annos sapiens*, 1165, 1408, 2, 5, see Marrou 1938, 202-3. See for the simile I 6, 42 *tardum seges occupabat annum.*

110-1.: One of the four instances in the *Silvae* where two successive verses exhibit the same metrical pattern, with the same word-divisions and syntax (II 1, 26-7 are metrically equal, but not otherwise): I 1, 86-7, I 5, 35-6, V 3, 26-7 (with elision). In III 5, 83 ff. even three successive verses exhibit the same metrical pattern, and almost the same word-divisions. Apparently this is coincidental, for it is difficult to connect a meaning to it, see Cancik, *Forschungsbericht* 12-3.

Wrestling and athletics were frowned upon by Roman moralists like Seneca (e.g. *Ep.* 88, 18-9, *cf.* Cic. *Tusc.* IV 70, *Rep.* IV 4, 4). Tacitus criticizes Nero for his *studia externa*, among others his interest in *gymnasia*: *Ann.* XIV 20, 3-4. Quintilian, however, had no objection to *paulum palaestris vacare* (*Inst.* I 11, 15). Of course the gymnasium was and remained popular and boys regularly visited it: Eyben 1977, 143-5.

The (typically Greek) combination of poetry and athletics occurs also at *Ach.* II 154 ff. In Greek epitaphs for children: Vérilhac no. 52 ὁ Πιερίδων γυμνασίου τε φίλος, 53, *cf.* 57.

catenatis curvatus membra palaestris: 'His limbs bent in enchaining wrestling-bouts'. A graphic representation: the legs fixed in the sand (*staret*), the upper part of the body bent (*curvatus membra*), the arms of the opponents enchained (*catenatis*).

The expression is studied: *curvatus* is rather rare before St., and then generally of old age: *TLL* IV 1546, 20 ff., but see, apart from *Th.* VI 649 *curvatus pectore* (a discus-thrower), Sen. *Dial.* VI 26, 2 *viros...ad ictum...gladii curvatos. Palaestrae* is said metonymically for wrestling-bouts: *Th.* VI 833, Verg. *A.* III 281, *cf.* Mart. X 55, 4. In his metonymic use of *catenatus* ('which enchains the participants') St. is the first: *TLL* III 607, 70. Moreover, it is apparently a conceit which he likes: III 1, 157 *nodare palaestras, Ach.* II 155 *nodare palen*, IV 2, 48 *resolutus gymnade.*

Amyclaea: 'Spartan', after the village of Amyclae at Sparta. It is Sts.' most frequent *synecdoche* for Spartan (e.g. II 2, 90); since Verg. *G.* III 89. Others are *Therapnaeus* (II 2, 111)[30] and *Taenarius*: Lunderstedt 25-6.

Amyclaea matre is general, 'a Spartan mother', because Sparta and wrestling belong together, see e.g. *Th.* VI 739-41, 770, Prop. III 14, 1. Others explain the phrase as 'Leda'. Then Glaucias would be compared to Pollux here. But he is more often mentioned as a pugilist (e.g. *Th.* VII

[30] *Therapnaeus* and *Therapnae* have coalesced into one lemma in the Concordance.

21, but see IV 2, 48). Moreover, the two following examples specify the general comparison here (see below), as in II 6, 24-8, and refer to boys so beautiful that a god fell in love with them. Pollux does not fit well in that context. For the general connection between Sparta and manly vigour, see II 6, 45-6.

112-3. Oebalides: Hyacinthus, descended from the Spartan pre-Dorian king Oebalus (Hyg. *Fab.* 78, 1 and 271, 1). This antonomy occurs since Ov. *Ib.* 586, VFl. IV 294. Also for 'Spartan' in general: *Th.* V 438.

Oebalius equally means 'descendant of Oebalus' and 'Spartan': *OLD* a, b, II 6, 27n.

St. again subtly associates (88-102n.): in the gymnasium Glaucias looked like a beautiful Spartan, for example Hyacinthus. The beautiful Hyacinthus was loved by a god (Apollo: Ov. *Met.* X 162 ff., *Amyclide*). So was the beautiful Hylas: both mentioned as *formosissimi ephebi* by Hyginus. Both died young and in a tragic fashion. The comparisons also imply a compliment to Melior himself.

praeceps: A characteristic *Überbietung*: Apollo not only would prefer Glaucias to Hyacinthus, he would effect a change (*mutare*: M, *mutaret*: M^2) at all speed. *Praeceps* is probably also to be supplied mentally with *Alcides pensaret.*

pensaret: Sen. *Oed.* 606 *permutat...et...pensat.*

Alcides: Hercules: I 3, 100, II 2, 24, III 1, 11, 51, 83, IV 2, 50, V 3, 165, since Verg. *Ecl.* 7, 61: Schubert 47.

113-9.: Glaucias recited Greek authors, dressed in Greek clothing.

In primary school boys already copied some passages from Greek and Latin poets, learning them by heart. But the real teaching of poetry, including reading aloud and memorizing, started with the *grammaticus*, at grammar school, where one went normally at 11 or 12 years: Bonner 136-7. Glaucias presumably had entered not long before (124-5n.). Roman boys perhaps did not start on Homer before this time. But then he was the first author to be read, the fountain-head of wisdom: Hor. *Ep.* II 4, 41-4, Petr. 5, Quint. *Inst.* I 8, 5, X 1, 46, Plin. *Ep.* II 14, 2. He is the first author to be mentioned as read in the school of Statius' father: V 3, 146 ff. (a useful list of authors treated in an ancient grammar-school).

Menander was more of a problem insofar as children were concerned (for his popularity in Rome: *RE* XV^1 714-8): the purpose of poetry in the grammar-school was to edify the pupils by giving them great poets to read. But Comedy could have a deteriorating effect upon morals. Quintilian advises letting boys attend a professional actor who could read them a suitable selection (*Inst.* I 11, 12-3). However, Ovid, and esp. St., suggest that he was read at school: *Tr.* II 369-70, *cf.* Aus. *Ep.* 22, 46-7

(an imitation of St.). But he is not mentioned in V 3. See Bonner 178, 212 ff. He was praised for his easy flow of words (*eloquendi facultas*, Quint. *Inst.* X 1, 69) and for his *inventio*: *omnem imaginem vitae expressit* (*ibid.*). See also *SG* II 193, and on St. and Menander (esp. III 5, 93, an unexplained reference): Garzya (unsatisfactory).

In inscriptions it is often stated of children that they were very gifted in artistical and intellectual matters, frequently with mention of the Muses. See on their φιλομαθία Robert 1965, 38 ff., Pleket no. 35, 4. Esp. the Muses: Vérilhac no. 62, 2; 70, 4; 71, 4; 76, 2; 77, 5-6, *CE* 1612, 3-5; 1165, 7-8; 1166, 5-6; 1408, 2, 5; 2274, 8; *CIL* VI 8401, 33929. Vérilhac no. 78 (= *IG* XIV 2012 and *ILS* 5177) is a monument for Q. Sulpicius Maximus who competed in the Capitoline games of 94 A.D. before he was 11 years of age (see II 2, 6-9n. on *laetum*). His effort is incised into the stone for us to read, *ne parentes affectibus suis indulsisse videant.* A child of 13 was laureated in the Capitoline games of 106 A.D., see *CIL* IX 2860. See Marrou 197-207, also for representations of these children on gravestones.

Graius amictu: σ. M has *gratus*, which is accepted by Vollm., Kl., Saeng., Postg., Mar., Traglia. Vollmer explains this as opposed to Glaucias' nakedness in the *palaestra.* But that certainly was also *gratus.*

Graius is exactly right. It fits the general context (106-24 above), just as in II 2, 95 and III 5, 94, where M also has *gratus* for *Graius*: Glaucias wears the Greek *pallium* (*himation*). This can be explained by two factors, one general and one specific.

The *pallium* had become very popular in imperial Rome for everyday wear, since it was more convenient than the *toga.* It was worn especially by the bookish upper middle class, which thereby symbolized its dedication to Greek culture (even by that former enemy of all things Greek, Cato): Tert. *Pallio* III 7, esp. VI 2 (the *pallium* speaks) *omnis liberalitas studiorum quattuor meis angulis tegitur.*

It was also worn as a more specific token of having to do with Greece, or Greek things: persons in high places could only permit themselves to be seen in Greek dress when they were in Greek surroundings: Liv. XXIX 19, 12: Scipio, Cic. *Rab.* 9, 27: Rabirius, Cic. *Ver.* II 4, 54, V 33, 52: Verres, Suet. *Tib.* 13: Tiberius, *SHA Hadr.* 22, 4-5, Dio LXIX 16, 1: Hadrian. Orators normally wore the *toga.* Only when they declaimed in Greek, they changed it for the *pallium*: The orator Argentarius is surprised at those *qui non contenti unius linguae eloquentia, cum latine declamaverant toga posita sumpto pallio quasi persona mutata rediebant et Graece declamabant* (note that he is surprised at the change of language, not at that of dress): Sen. *Con.* IX 3, 13. The same connection between language and dress is clear from an anecdote in Pliny: Valerius Lici-

nianus, as an exile, is not allowed to wear the *toga*. So he appears in a *pallium* and *circumspexit habitum suum. 'Latine', inquit, 'declamaturus sum'*: *Ep.* IV 11, 4.

So St. means here: 'when wrestling (as a Greek, *viz.* naked), and when declaiming as a Greek (made clear by his clothes)'. For (part of) this interpretation: Bieber, with overwhelming archaeological evidence, esp. 411-7 for evaluation.

facundi: Quint. *Inst.* X 1, 69 above. It has a somewhat prosaic flavour, for it does not occur in Catul., Lucr., Verg., Tib., Prop., Luc., VFl., Sil.: Nisbet-H. on Hor. *Carm.* I 10, 1. St., however, has it 6 times, including one use concerning the lyre (I 2, 3). *Facundia* too is used 6 times, and once more as a personification of Literature (V 3, 90). It never occurs in Sts.' epics, so perhaps it is not so much prosaic as connected with a more personal style.

orsa: Literary products, e.g. IV 7, 55, VFl. I 21, Aus. *Ep.* 22, 46-7 *orsa Menandri...evolvenda tibi*, see Vollm. on I 4, 25.

decurrere: 'to declaim quickly', or rather 'easily'. In this sense the word occurs only here. At V 3, 149, however, it has a similar meaning: *quantus...pugnas...decurrere versu Maeonides*, 'to describe in easily flowing verse'. The context is similar too (*discere* 48). See *percurrere*, 'to skim over' (*OLD* 3b, 5): Calp. *Ecl.* 1, 25 *percurrere versus*, Claud. *Carm.* 30, 147-8 *quos Smyrna dedit, quos Mantua libros/ percurrere.*

sonus: The Muse, Thalia, admires the sound, the musicality, the schoolmasters and the boy's father his intelligence, *sensus* (Morillon 319-20), that is to say his artistic interpretation (*ibid.* 215-6, 318-9): Plin. *Ep.* V 16, 3 *quam studiose, quam intellegenter lectitabat!*, Quint. *Inst.* VI *praef.* 11 *vocis iucunditas claritasque, oris suavitas et in utracumque lingua...expressa proprietas omnium litterarum*, Aus. *Ep.* 22, 46-7 *numeros doctis accentibus effer* (= *sonus*), *affectusque impone* (= *sensus*).

fregisset: M. The correction *pressisset* must be accepted out of mBσ. All editors, except Phill., print *fregisset*, presumably explaining (after Gronovius) *crinis frangitur* as *deprimitur et sic destruitur* (see Vollm.). But *frangere capillum* can only mean 'to curl, to wave the hair': Sen. *Con.* I *praef.* 8, Quint. *Inst.* I 6, 44. *Premere* has many parallels: I 2, 228 *crinem premit...coronā*, V 2, 231, *Th.* X 606, Verg. *A.* IV 147, Luc. II 318 *premens frontem...coronā*, V 60, Sen. *Phaed.* 651, see van Dam 383-4.

laudaret...pressisset: St. sometimes employs the imperfect and the pluperfect without distinction: I 1, 59-60 *portaret...durasset*, 100-1, II 1, 140-5, III 5, 8-10, V 1, 66-9, V 3, 51-4, 62-3 (subjunct. in all cases).

In poetry there exists a tendency to replace the impf. by a plupf., which is rare in prose. This is clearly seen already in Prop. and Ov.: Smith on Tib. II 5, 79. In imperial times it is esp. the plupf. of the sub-

junctive which ousts the impf., e.g. Petr. 76, 11 *putasses* for *putares*, Suet. *Vesp.* 8, 4 *maluissem* instead of *mallem.* Impf. and plupf. are considered as equivalent where they express a repeated action in the past: Kühner-St. II 206-7 (*cf.* I 140-1), Ernout-Thomas §§ 260, 376, 389-90, Scherer 73, 83.

rosea...corona: The boy is crowned with a garland of roses, since this symbolizes youth and joy, because of the use of roses at dinner parties and in sexual affairs: Hehn 205, Blümner 1911, 400 n. 15, Bömer on Ov. *Fast.* I 345 (p. 42). On the other hand the garland is also symbolic of his impending death: 106-9n., *cf.* the behaviour of Lachesis and Invidia in 120-4. In Hyacinthus and Hylas St. has already alluded to the death to come.

Thalia: St. seems to be the first to attribute the province of Comedy to Thalia, here and at V 3, 98 *quis lasciva vires tenuare Thalia.* Before him she is either the Muse of poetry in general (Hor. *Carm.* IV 6, 25, Ov. *Fast.* V 54), or the Muse of the lesser *genres*: Bucolic: Verg. *Ecl.* 6, 2, *Culex* 1 (see Leo there), Elegy: Ov. *Ars* I 264, Epigram: Mart. IV 8, 12 (Friedländer), VII 17, 4 *lascivae -ae,* VIII 73, 3, IX 26, 8, *al.*

The only places earlier than St. where she is specified as the Muse of Comedy are a Herculanean fresco subscribed Θαλεια. κωμωδιαν (= *CIG* III 5866) and (perhaps) *AP* IX 504 and 505, see *RE* XVI 729-30, Roscher (*Lex.*) V 453. After St. she is the Muse of Comedy also in *Anth.Lat.* 88, 3 (Florus), 664 (*Appendix Auson.*), Aus. *Ep.* 14, 28, Sid. *Ep.* VIII 11, 3, and in a lost ms. entitled 'About the Names, Provinces and Representants of the Muses', where s.v. *Thalia* was written Κωμῳδίας Μένανδρος (Roscher *Lex.* V 450).

Even so it is not certain that St. thought of the Muses as having each their own province of culture, for this is a development of late antiquity, see *RE loc. cit.* 724 ff., Roscher (*Lex.*) *loc. cit.* 449, Todd, esp. 15-29.

Maeonium...senem: Homer, for Maeonia is the eastern part of Lydia, and Homer was a Lydian. The adj. occurs first at Verg. *G.* IV 380, for Homer since *Ciris* 62 or Hor. *Carm.* I 6, 2 (see Nisbet-H. there), see Ov. *Ars* II 4 *Maeonio seni.* In St.: V 3, 26, *Ach.* I 4, *Maeonides* V 3, 130, 150.

The author is named, instead of his work, like V 3, 168. And the content of his work is circumscribed, following customary procedure. Sometimes this develops into attributing the action of the poem to the poet: II 7, 57n.

Almost the same descriptions of Iliad and Odyssey occur at II 7, 48-9, V 3, 148-50.

stupuere: In the *Silvae stupere* always has a positive connotation (9 occurrences): what is new and surprising is (therefore?) laudable, *cf.* esp. V

3, 136 *stupuit primaeva ad carmina plebes.* In Horace, on the contrary, *stupere* is always (6 occurrences) used as a condemnation. This may be interpreted as a sign that St. is no *laudator temporis acti*, see Pavlovskis 1973, 1 ff., Hegyi, *General Intr.* § 4, II 2 *Intr.* It must, however, be remarked that, in the Thebaid generally, in the Achilleid sometimes, *stupere* has negative overtones.

The sudden indic., after the subjunctives, underlines the content of the word, *cf.* 64-6n.

120-4.: The explanation of early death as caused by the malevolence and envy of the gods is very ancient and very frequent in literature, see Vollm. on I 4, 17, II *praef.* 5, II 4, 3n., II 5, 11-3n., esp. II 6, 58-9n., II 7, 90, V 1, 137-46, E.-F. 138 §§ 31-2 and below. Menander advises to use this *topos* at the outset of the monodia: χρὴ τοίνυν ἐν τούτοις τοῖς λόγοις εὐθὺς μὲν σχετλιάζειν ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τοὺς δαίμονας καὶ πρὸς μοῖραν ἄδικον, 435, 9 *Sp.*, see Soffel's note.

The personification of Invidia is not uncommon either (but see on II 6, 68-75): e.g. Ov. *Met.* II 760 ff., see Bömer there, Lier 475 ff., *RE* XIX 1053 ff., Fortgens on *Th.* VI 27, Schetter 27 ff. with more recent literature, but St. has characteristically turned the whole into a picture: Lachesis touching the cradle, Invidia fondling the child on her lap, *cf.* 137-8.

By touching the cradle Lachesis casts an unhappy spell. Some motifs have coalesced here, notably the influence of the Parcae on human life, and the concept of harm done by touching something.

The Fates, or Parcae, or Moirai, are often personified in Latin poetry: Tels-de Jong 88-92. Their main characteristic in Latin funerary poetry is envy: *CLE* 422, 10; 472, 3; 547, 4; 1164, 4; 1122, 7; 1206, 1; 1222, 5 *invida nascenti Lachesis fuit, invida Clotho*; *cf.* 1029, 7-8 *Laeserunt Parcae...Invidia saevo voluit nos sternere luctu*, 1141, 13, on *Invidia* below, *RE* XV^2 2478 ff. The Parcae, like Fatum, Fata, Fortuna bestow life on man and take it away, *cf.* 148, 155, II 6, 58-9n., 103-5n., *CE* 1552 A, 69-71, Pikhaus 55 and n. 109, 58, Tels-de Jong 67-85. Since their power starts with the birth of a new life, they are sometimes represented as present at delivery: *RE loc. cit.* 2485 ff. The Moirai and Eileithyia are mentioned together at Paus. IX 11, 3.

Here Lachesis is pictured as cursing the child, a folklore motif: S. Thompson F 312.1.1 and 316[31]: a fairy, Fates *etc.* preside at birth, give supernatural gifts, or lay a curse; for example, the Sleeping Beauty.

That she works her magic by touching can also be paralleled: touching, esp. with the right hand, is considered as beneficiary at birth,

---

[31] Referring to W. B. McDaniel, *Conception* (Coconut Grove 1948) which is not accessible to me.

illness *etc.*, e.g. I 4, 103: Wagenvoort 14-59, Weinreich 1909, esp. 15 ff., Onians 494-8. '*Wie alle religiösen Vorstellungen des Altertums der Gedanke durchzieht, dass die Kraft zu segnen und zu heilen unzertrennlich sei von der zu schaden und zu vernichten, so auch* (*die*) *Hand...zu schaden*': Weinreich 1909, 55, see Petr. 63, 7 *quia...illum tetigerat mala manus*, 140, 12 *Mercurius... reddidit mihi quod manus irata praeciderat* (sc. *usum penis*), *Anth.Lat.* 995, 8 *iniecere manus invida fata mihi*, Weinreich 1909, 55-9, Wagenvoort 126 ff., 135 ff., 142.

Lachesis: The names of the Parcae are rarely mentioned in Latin poetry (never in Vergil), but St. has *Atropos* 5 times in the Thebaid, 4 in the *Silvae* (she seems to be mentioned most often, see *RE loc. cit.*, e.g. Mart. X 44, 6), *Clotho* 3 (*Th.*) and 1, *Lachesis* 5 (*Th.*) and 2 (also III 5, 40). There are no distinct tasks for each of the Parcae.

infausta...dextra: *Oxymoron*, also V 1, 141 about Invidia.

gremio...complexa fovebat Invidia: A bitter contrast with 78-81. *Fovere* for parents and the like: I 2, 110 *fovique sinu nec colla genasque comere nec...crinem deducere...cessavit...manus* (*cf.* 122), V 1, 47 (119), V 5, 70. In *Th.* I 61 Oedipus refers to the Fury having fondled him, *gremio fovisti*. See II 7, 36-41n.

For *complexa*: 148, II 6, 77-8, *Th.* II 333 *complexa iacebat/*, Luc. VIII 67 *astrictos refovet complexibus artus*.

Invidia: In *Silvae* II not many personifications occur, and most of them are weak: *Natura* (34, 83), *Invidia* (here, II 6, 69), *Nemesis* (II 6, 73), *Fortuna* (II 2, 127, II 6, 9, 68), *Fata* (154, II 6, 59, 103), *Bruma, Sirius, Autumnus* (II 1, 215-7), *Phosphorus* (II 6, 79), *Mortes* (II 7, 131). Most of them occur in *consolationes*.

Envy, personified or not, is one of the most important concepts in the reaction of the survivors in the case of death. Whether there is mention of Νέμεσις, Φθόνος, Θεοί, Τύχη, Invidia, Ira Deorum, Fata, Parcae *etc.*, the chief thought is always that higher powers are lying in wait to destroy happiness. Essential words in the *carmina epigraphica* are *invidus, invidia, invidere*, e.g. *CE* 54, 1-3; 386, 4; 428, 1; 647, 1-2 *natos habere bonu est, si non sint invida fata*; 1059, 1-2; 1065, 1-2; 1171, 1-4; 1311, 3. See Robert 1965, 143, Pikhaus 62 ff., 117 ff., Versnel 1981, 164, 175 (with n. 2 for literature), the beginning of this note above, 137-57n. below.

comere...monstrare...infigere: As the ed. Bipontina remarks: '(*Invidiam*) *formasse mores et ingenium ut haberet quod sibi displiceret*', see Ov. *Met.* II 780-2 (*Invidia*) *videt...intabescitque videndo successus hominum...suppliciumque suum est*[32]: Envy made Glaucias so special that her Envy (= she herself), an image for 'the envy of the gods', killed him.

[32] I retract my former opinion (1980, 384) that for *et* (123) Baehrens' *haec* must be read.

The use of the historic infinitive in poetry apparently varies according to the authors' personal preference: it is never found in Lucr., Catul., Tib., Prop., Pers., Juv., only once in Ovid (*Met.* VII 640, but see Bömer's note), sometimes in Horace (but not in the Odes), and more frequently in Vergil (about 30 occurrences, only 1 outside the Aeneid: *G.* I 385). St., like VFl. and Sil., does not avoid it: in the Thebaid *c.* 25 examples occur, in the *Silvae* it is found at II 1, 129, V 2, 41, V 3, 99, 146, 235, V 5, 85: Wölfflin 177-86, *LHSz.* 367, Perrochat 73-5 (nothing in Lohr or Clement).

adultum: 'Full-grown'. It refers to luxuriance (for vegetation (106-9n.): e.g. *Th.* VIII 299, IX 410, Sen. *HerF.* 699), and to Glaucias' precocity.

verba infigere: Verg. *A.* IV 4 *infixi pectore vultus verbaque*, Quint. *Inst.* IX 4, 29 *verbum...adsignatur auditori et infigitur*, Plin. *Ep.* I 20, 20, van Dam 384 n. 14. *Cf.* V 5, 81-2 *cui verba...monstravi.*

quae nunc: See II 3, 66-7n.

124-36.: After a plaintive note (*plangimus*, see 157) St. starts again and should say something about the boy's *res gestae*, see E.-F. 134 § 24, 25D, Men. 413, 11 ff., 420, 21 ff. *Sp.*, for speeches also Kierdorf 71 ff., esp. 75-80. But in the case of an early death this is often omitted. The reference to the Labours of Hercules—which, at first sight, seems dragged in—may be an allusion to this *topos.* Its chief function is to juxtapose big and small (175-8n.): the strong, big Hercules, and the boy, almost an infant (125), yet big for his age (126-7).

Glaucias' age and precocious growth (124-7, esp. *gressus* 126/108) point back (106-24n.), and lead over to a compliment to Melior which closes the *laudatio*: 127-36 (36-136n.), at the same time putting Glaucias in his place a bit nastily.

Though mention of the age at death can be the beginning of the *Descriptio morbi et mortis* (II 6, 70 ff., V 3, 252 ff.), it is better to consider *decori* (136) as the end of the *laudatio*: 36-136n.

124-5. Herculeos annis aequare labores coeperat: This means that Glaucias had reached 12 years of age. Mart. VI 28, 8-9 *bis senis modo messibus peractis/ vix unum puer applicabat annum* is usually interpreted as if Martial made Glaucias one year older than St. does: Vollm., Fr. 57 n. 3, Heuvel 321. But no difference is, I think, implied: *coeperat aequare* = *messibus peractis*, the boy's 12th birthday had passed. *Vix unum applicabat annum* I take as 'had hardly begun to add one year', *cf.* II 6, 71-2 *nectere temptabat...unam trieterida*, impf. tense in both cases.

Herculeos for *Herculis*, e.g. I 2, 39, I 5, 22, *Caesareus* in II 4, 30, *Nestoreus* I 3, 110, I 4, 127, *Bell. Germ.* 1. Some forms of these words can not be

used in hexameters (‒◡‒ before consonants): see for *Herculeus* and *Alcides* Norden 1912², 121 f. The tendency to use these adjectives also where the gen. of the noun would be metrically possible is probably based on analogy with forms like *Cerbereos* for *Cĕrbĕrī* (V 1, 249, *Th.* VIII 56), *Romuleus* for *Rōmŭlī* (IV 6, 79) and others: Schubert 13 (literature n. 1).

assurgens[33]: *Assurgere* meaning 'to grow up' is apparently not used elsewhere for human beings (*OLD* 3a, b, *TLL* II 938, 73). It is taken from the world of plants and trees, e.g. Verg. *G.* III 355, see *OLD* 3a, *adultum* above, 106-9n. In 185 St. uses it in the sense 'to rise up', for hair *etc.*

infantia: II *Praef.* 5-6 *Glauciam nostrum, cuius gratissima infantia...*, 104-5n.

iuxta: M², *mixta*: M (only in the *app. crit.* of Kl., Postg., Traglia), conjectured independently by Markland. Vollm. is the only one to read *mixta*, treating it as a conjecture. He explains '*mit seinen Jahren war also noch Kindlichkeit gemischt*'. *Infantia mixta annis* would be yet more strangely expressed than *vox mixta favis*, or *ora mixta notis*, see 48-9n. So I prefer *iuxta*: 'still near, just over', see *Th.* VIII 610 *nec mala quae iuxta, sed longa ab origine fati, OLD* 1b. Not '*era nel periodo dell'infanzia*': Traglia-Ar.

It is contrasted with *tamen*, as *sed* is with *assurgens.* Markland's *et* (read by Baehr., Phill., Sb.) is superfluous.

126-7. mensura...maior cultibus: 'His height outstripped his dress': Mozl. *Mensura* for human stature: *Ach.* I 763 *mensura iacentum, TLL* IX¹ 766, 38 ff. *Cultus*, clothes: *Th.* VI 79-81 *vestes...cultusque...purpureos, OLD* 6a.

Visae...vestes repeats the first statement, but with a change in the point of view: the boy's size was bigger than his dress, and his clothes seemed to shrink upon him.

128-35.: Melior is praised because he constantly bought new clothes for Glaucias. These, moreover, were not wide (131), which would have been an economical thing to do for a fast-growing boy. That is to say **1)** Melior follows the fashion of his time in buying tight-fitting clothes: Luc. II 362-4 *fluxos gemmis astrinxit amictus...umerisque haerentia primis suppara nudatos cingunt angusta lacertos*, Quint. *Inst.* XI 3, 139 *ipsam togam rutundam esse et apte caesam velim, aliter enim multis modis fiet enormis.* **2)** Perhaps this is a defence against dissolute living which was associated with loose dress: *Eleg. Maec.* 25-6 *tunicae...solutae...ventosi...sinus.* **3)** For Glaucias no expense is too high; Melior dresses him in great style, *cf.* Tac. *Ger.* 17, 1

[33] The Concordance has made two separate lemmas of *assurgens* (2 occurrences) and *assurgo* (13, out of which 6 are present participles).

locupletissimi veste distinguuntur, non fluitante, sicut Sarmatae ac Parthi, sed stricta et singulos artus exprimente. Melior's generosity is praised again and again: 69 *tanto*, 77-8, 157-65, II 3, 70-1, II 4, 11-3, 33-7.

Critics have often changed these verses in one or more points, chiefly because they could not understand why Melior bought such small clothes, which could even endanger Glaucias' health (Markland). For a detailed critical discussion see Håk. 50-1, some additions van Dam 384-5.

Sts.' love of variation (2n.) is at its most evident here: *cultus, vestes, gestamina, laenis, telas, lacerna, sinus, texta, amictu. Cf.* 137-44 *inimica, feros, gravis, saeva, fera, crudeles, torvus, insanos, perosus*, I 2, 52 ff. *thalamo, fulcra, toros, stratis, lecto*, I 3, 76 ff., III 2, 42 ff.

128-30. vestes: The repetition (127, 128) was suspected by some critics (Markl., Housman, Courtney). But it is emphatic (as Vollm. says), and repetition is not uncommon in the *Silvae*, e.g. *sinus* 131, 133, see 47-8n., 218-9, II 2, 68-72n., II 3, 33-5 (even apart from the insistent repetition of connectives, see 56-66n., II 2, 123-7n.).

non: *Apo koinou* with *quas* and *quae* (Courtney 1968, 54), see Verg. *A.* VI 92 *quas gentis Italum aut quae non oraveris urbes*, Ov. *Ep.* 11, 39, Juv. 3, 309 *qua fornace...qua non incude.* The idiom is Greek and means *omnis*: τίνας οὐ = ἁπάσας, see Austin on *A.* VI 92.

gestamina: Anything that is worn or carried on the body (arms, ceremonial objects, jewels): *OLD* 1a. It is only seldom used for dress, and St. is the first to do so, see *Th.* X 643 *vatum gestamina* (= *vitta*), Apul. *Met.* XI 9, *CE* 1348A 1 *consimiles fratrum trabeis gestamina* (A.D. 406), *TLL* VI^2 1953, 42 ff. St. has chosen a vague word which also includes *gemmis* 134.

festinabat: 'To perform, make...without delay': *OLD* 6a, e.g. Verg. *A.* IV 575 *festinare fugam* (see Pease), Hor. *Ep.* I 2, 61 - *poenas*, esp. Ov. *Met.* XI 574-5 *quas induat ille/ festinat vestes.* See also *A.* IX 488-9 (*nec te*) *veste tegens tibi quam noctes festina diesque/ urguebam et tela curas solabar anilis. Th.* VI 79 ff. are secluded by editors. But even if they are spurious, they may imitate not only Vergil, but also this passage of St.: *quas non...vestes urguebat* (Opheltes' mother, see 182 here).

mitis: A favourite word of St.: Tib. 7, Prop. 1, Verg. 5, Hor. 5, Luc. 6, VFl. 6, Mart. 16. The only poets to use it frequently are Silius (30), Ovid (86, probably influencing St.), and St. himself: 61, of which 24 in the *Silvae.*

129-30.: 'He would fasten a small tunic on your chest and contract the fabric with a narrow cloak'. *Angusta* (:σ, *augusta*: M, *cf.* II 4, 11-5n.) repeats *brevibus*, and *artare* is *constringere.* Parallels for these words: Hier.

Ep. 64, 18 *zonam...qua sacerdotis pectus artatur et linea tunica constringitur*, 38, 4 *cingulum...quod possit adstringere magis vestimenta quam stringere*, Tert. *Cult. Fem.* I 2 *circulos ex auro quibus bracchia artantur*, Claud. *VICons.Hon.* 526 *viridi...angustat iaspide pectus.*

telas: When used of clothes, it is generally the material which is stressed; apparently it is not employed to designate a specific article of clothing, as here. But St. innovated more terms in this field: *vellera* for *vittae* at V 3, 8, *stamen* for *chlamys* at *Th.* VI 545, see Lunderstedt 59 ff., Håk. 51.

laenis: The word comes from Greek χλαῖνα, though the actual form of the *laena* was inspired rather by Gallic or Iberian examples. It was originally a thick circular woollen cape, often worn folded in two. In Imperial times it became popular, for men and women alike, and *laenae* dyed all colours were worn on elegant occasions: Verg. *A.* IV 262 (still as an un-Roman luxury), Pers. 1, 32 *hyacinthia laena*, Mart. VIII 59, 10, Juv. 3, 283 *coccina laena*: Daremberg-Saglio IV 291-2, *RE* XII 419-20.

lacerna: Like the *laena*, the *lacerna* developed from a practical article of dress into a smart jacket. It was also, like the *laena*, inspired by Gallic or Iberian examples rather than by Greek ones. Originally it was a fringed, and probably hooded, short mantle for a soldier, thrown around the shoulders and closed with a fibula. Augustus proscribed its use on the Forum, and in Hadrian's time it still was not done for senators to wear the *lacerna*. But it quickly became the fashion in other circles in Rome and *lacernae* in all colours were worn over the *toga*, for instance in the theatre, e.g. Sen. *Ep.* 114, 21 (denouncing it, of course), Mart. V 8 and 23, VI 59, 5 and often, Juv. 1, 27: Daremberg-Saglio III 901-2, *RE* XII 327-9, Blümner 1911, 215-7. In St. also at IV 9, 24.

131-5.: After stating the same thing twice again (*enormes non...sinus, sed...ad annos texta*), St. dwells on the different colours (36-136n.) chosen by Melior, *legens* (:σ, *leges*: M) testifying to his interest in the boy and to his taste. There is no reason for putting a full stop after *legens* with Vollmer. Note the variation: *puniceo* (colour mentioned), *imitante* (comparison), *murice* (*synecdoche*).

puniceo...rubenti murice: *Puniceus* is scarlet, a bright red: André 1949, 88-9. *Rubenti murice* (= *sinu rubenti muricis colore*) is purple. *Rubens* is unmarked and can refer to any reddish colour: Gel. II 26, 5 *cum aliter rubeat ignis, aliter sanguis, aliter ostrum, aliter crocum, aliter aurum, has singulas rufi varietates Latina oratio...omnia...significat una 'ruboris' appellatione*, André 1949, 76-7. The meaning 'purple' is introduced by *murice.* The phrase imitates Verg. *Ecl.* 4, 43-4 *suave rubenti murice.* The purple perhaps makes good for the *praetexta* (136).

herbas imitante: Green, *cf.* II 2, 91 *quod viret et molles imitatur...herbas*, Klotz 1898 *ad loc.*, André 1949, 184 ff., *cf.* Mart. V 23, 1 *Herbarum fueras indutus, Basse, colores.* Marastoni holds (*Add.* p. 142, on I 5, 37) that *dulce rubenti* explains *herbas imitante*, and that both refer to a yellowish colour, because (!) *purpureus* can mean 'yellow'. In the first place this is not true (*cf.* André 1949, 90-102); in the second place *rubere* can refer to a yellowish-red colour, but not to the greenish-yellow of grass (André 1949, 75 ff.). Thirdly, *puniceo, herbas imitante, rubenti* do not explain each other, as is made clear by *modo...nunc* (below).

dulce: Sts.' visual attitude is illustrated by the fact that all occurrences of *dulcis* having to do with seeing in *TLL* come from St.: *Th.* IV 274 *dulce rubens*, V 608, IX 701, 702, *Ach.* I 161, *Silv.* I 2, 12, 112, III 1, 161 (?), III 2, 138 (?), III 4, 8, III 5, 100.

modo...nunc...nunc: 170, V 1, 161-4 *modo...nunc...nunc, Th.* IX 773-5, II 4, 30-1 *quondam...nunc*, Skutsch & Vollmer 828.

digitos incendere: To set his fingers on fire. For the metaphor, see *Th.* VII 694-5 *clipeum galeamque incendit...sidere*, X 60 *purpura...incenditur... auro* (with Williams), Verg. *A.* V 88 *squamam incendebat fulgor*, Mart. XIV 26, 1, Claud. *Rapt. Pros.* I 254, *VICons.Hon.* 166 *Phaethon glaucos incendit amictus*, see *Th.* V 438-40 *chlamys ardet...coma fulgurat auro*, *Th.* XII 527-8 *ignea gemmis cingula*, VFl. I 346 *umeros ardentem vellere*, Claud. *Ruf.* II 347 *ardentes gemmae.* For the other point of view: I 3, 49 *dignas digitis contingere gemmas.*

vivis: For 'sparkling' the only parallel seems to be Plin. *Nat.* XXXVI 30, 2 *vivi lapides*, flintstone (but *cf.* II 3, 39-42n.), which well illustrates its meaning here.

gemmis: 'Rings', e.g. I 3, 49, III 4, 52, Juv. 1, 29, *OLD* 4.

gaudebat: With the inf. II 2, 24, 64, 93, II 6, 105. Since Acc. *trag.* 31. It is the only verb of emotion which is constructed with inf. already in early Latin, see *LHSz.* 346, *TLL* VI 1704, 10 ff.

135-6.: At the end of the *laudatio*, St. makes clear that Glaucias, after all, was only a freedman. If he had been free-born, he could have worn the *praetexta* up to his puberty: Marquardt 124, 545, Blümner 1911, 221. In the same way as with Ursus' little Philetus (II 6, 56-7) St. apparently thinks it apt to allude to the deceased's low birth at this moment.

turba comes: Pedagogues and other servants, see *Ach.* I 741 *famularis turba*, Ov. *Rem.* 182 *comites, sedula turba, canes*, Sen. *Thy.* 901.

cessant: 'To stop, give out': *OLD* 2b, *Th.* IV 690, X 538, *Silv.* I 2, 27 (contrast vs. 94), Verg. *A.* II 468, VFl. IV 414, Sil. XIV 553.

deerat: Scanned *dēerāt* here, like I 2, 123, V 2, 162, *Th.* VIII 368, X 437. Around the scansion of *deesse* in St. a whole literature flowers,

because the mss. give *dĕĕssĕ* in 3 places (*Th.* VIII 236, X 236, XI 276), which is unparalleled in Latin except for Cypr. *Gall. Exod.* 1135. For references see Venini on *Th.* XI 276, add O. Mueller 1861, 13, Housman 1933, 12.

verecundo: See 40n., Plin. *Ep.* V 16, 2 *virginali verecundia*, Ambros. *Off. min.* I (= *PL* XVI 19 (83)) *verecundia...vultus...solet pudore obfundere gratioresque reddere...verecundia in ipso quoque corporis decore plus eminet.*

137-57. DESCRIPTIO MORBI AC MORTIS: It has two parts: 137-46 describing the illness, 147-57 describing death and foreshadowing the *consolatio* proper.

In all of these descriptions it is the moment of dying which is described; the illness itself is almost never explored or specified (only at V 1, 150-3, 158-60 and V 3, 258-61 some attention is paid to it). Instead St. resorts to mythological metaphors of the Fates *etc.* attacking the dead person, both when he describes the illness (137-8, II 6, 76-9, V 1, 145-6, 155-7) and when he depicts the moment of death (147-8, *cf.* Verg. *A.* IV 698). In Greek inscriptions it is often said that the dead one (a child in general) is snatched away by higher powers, see 208-9n., II 6, 100-2n.: the Moirai: Vérilhac no. 61 A, 1; 61 C, 2, 94 A, 4; 94 B, 1; 96, 13; 109, 5; 130, 4; 143, 4; 154, 3; 158, 1; 167, 5; 183, 2; Tuche: 57, 8; 66 A, 4; Envy: 43, 3; 56, 5. For Envy, see also 120-4n. above and on the identity of these powers, see II 6, 58-9n., 72-5n. Sometimes the descriptions are preceded by a remark upon the good fortune enjoyed up to the moment of falling ill: 137, III 3, 164-71, V 1, 143-4 *Quid...posset Fortuna timeri, cf.* II 4, 4-8, II 6, 67-70, II 7, 81-2, 102-3, III 3, 126-7 *gaudia.*

Here, after the introductory remark, the Parca is depicted attacking the boy and apostrophized. The rest of the *descriptio morbi* is in fact a lament about the cruelty of destiny (140-5, *cf.* E.-F. 138-9 § 32), illustrated by 4 mythological comparisons.

The description of death is introduced by mention of the seventh day. It consists in other respects too of conventional elements (146-54). The vss. 154-7 close the whole by describing Glaucias' body. This points back, by referring to beauty, the binding element in the descriptions (155-7/ 139, *cf.* 36-136n.), and by thanking the Fates after all (154 *Fata*/ 138 *Parca*). It points forward because it is an argument of consolation, already prepared by 153 *consolatur.*

137-9. subitas...manus: The hands of mythical beings attacking the dying are often depicted: 138, II 6, 78-9, Ov. *Am.* II 6, 39, III 9, 20, *cf.* II 6, 59, *Th.* I 706 *Parcarum praenosse manus*, Hor. *Epod.* 5, 93-4 *petamque voltus umbra curvis unguibus, quae vis deorum est manium*, Luc. I 113-4, Sen. *Ep.* 111, 4, *CE* 995, 8, 120-4n.

St. often uses an adj. instead of an adverb (*subito*), e.g. 5, 34, 56, 75, 138, 206, II 4, 33, III 3, 2, 33, V 3, 201: Vollm. on I 2, 250. This is a growing tendency in poetry from the times of Augustus onward, for metrical reasons and under the influence of Greek, see Schubert 16-7, Priess, *LHSz.* 161, 172-3, 817. Apart from the general tendency in hexametric poetry to provide each noun with an adj., St. (and others) wants to concretize or depict someone or something rather than to use the abstract adverb, *cf.* Marouzeau 1935 (1970^3) 138 '*l'adverbe...supposant une démarche de l'esprit qui relève de l'abstraction est peu fait pour la poésie...l'adjectif a...l'avantage...de ne pas dissimuler la vision concrète des choses*'. He goes especially far in this use with adjectives qualifying 'hands' or other parts of the body: 11-2n., II 3, 10-1n., II 6, 8-9n., *feros ungues* in 138.

Subitus for *subito* occurs already in Plautus (*LHSz.* 172), often in Vergil and Ovid (Priess 65-6, e.g. Verg. *A.* II 680, where Servius notes **subitum** *pro* **subito**). I know no example with *manus* ('suddenly attacking'), but see III 4, 28 *subita...figura.* For the attack of death with *subitus*: II 4, 3 *subito...fato*, II 5, 24 *subiti leti*, V 3, 195-6 *subitam...civilis Erinys...facem...movit.*

levavit: Denoting a menace, like *Th.* VI 779 *levat ecce* (sc. *manum*) *diuque minatur*, 836-7. This implication of *levare* is not found elsewhere: *TLL* VII^2 1232, 27 ff. See also II 5, 21.

inimica: Is not found elsewhere for Parcae. For other divine beings: e.g. Verg. *A.* II 622, Ov. *Pont.* II 9, 8 *Fortuna*, VFl. II 225-6 *diva, TLL* VI 1628, 81 ff.

St. likes compounds with *in-*: Heuvel on *Th.* I 50, Schamberger 289-90.

diva: For the sudden apostrophe, see 52-4n. Here it is pathetic in combination with the anaphora and the rhetorical question of 138.

feros...exseris ungues: *Ungues* was conjectured by Scaliger and Meursius for M's *angues* (see van Dam 385-6): the Parcae are never described as wearing snakes in (or instead of) their hair; this is only said of the Furies: Klotz 1896, 75, see Vollm. Moreover, *manus* and *carpere* (140) strongly suggest *ungues* and so does *exserere*: *Th.* II 513-4 *acuens exsertos protinus ungues liventisque manus*, see *Ach.* I 346 *exserta bracchia*, 769 *exsertas...manus*, Luc. II 95-6 *saevas...exseruere manus*, and, for *ungues*: *Th.* VIII 380-1 (*Mors viros*) *cruento ungue notat.*

forma...aetas: 36-136n., 178. See *Th.* X 751-2 *non ullius aetas/non cultus non forma movet.*

lacrimabilis: 'Pitiful', e.g. *Th.* X 357 *abruptis...lacrimabilis annis*, Ov. *Met.* II 796. *Lacrimabilis* and *flebilis* (3) could be explained as 'crying' and as 'deserving tears' already in Old Latin, see *tristis* 18. For that reason they became the example for other adjectives in *-bilis* with an active meaning: Löfstedt 1936, 84.

140-5.: Four carefully constructed mythological comparisons (88-100n.), in the form of *Überbietungen* (8-12n.): Even the most merciless persons were not as cruel as the Parca is: *saeva, fera, torvus.*

All four persons mentioned murdered a small boy (or two), in the first three cases their own children: Procne killed her son Itys and served him to her husband Tereus, Medea (*Colchis*) slew her two sons by Jason, Athamas shot his son Learchus, and Ulysses threw Hector's son Astyanax from the walls of Troy. Glaucias is, as it were, substituted for these killed children: *hunc, hoc, hunc.* Each of the murderers is given a reason for his deed, that is to say that they would have refrained from killing Glaucias, because of his youth and beauty, in spite of their cruelty and their having a motive for such an outrage: Procne bore her husband a grudge (*saeva viro*), Medea was jealous of her rival (142), Athamas was mad (*insanos*), and Ulysses hated Troy and Hector (*perosus*).

Two women and two men are mentioned; the first two of each group have one verse, the second two, two verses. The reasons are given in an adj. in the one-line instances, in a whole verse in the others. This symmetry is broken by variation: **1)** in tense: pluperf. in 140-1, 145, imperf. in 142-3, *cf.* 113-9n., **2)** because the first and second comparison are formulated in the negative, the third and fourth in the positive, **3)** because of lexical variation (128-35n.), **4)** in the first and fourth one, *hunc* is the object of killing, in the third one it is *ab hoc*, in the second one no object is expressed, **5)** the last two are more concrete and pictorial (*arcus flecteret, turribus flesset missurus*).

The first three comparisons are more closely connected than the fourth one with either of them: this is the only one where the murdered boy is not the killer's child. Medea follows on Procne, because in both cases a scorned woman wants to strike her husband in what is dearest to him (and to herself), Athamas is perhaps an association with *Aeolia* (below), but in the case of Ulysses a connection is missing.

140. saeva viro...Procne: For the dative with *saevus*, see *Th.* III 638-9 *Thymbraee, vocanti/ non alias tam saeve mihi*, Verg. *A.* I 458 *saevum ambobus Achillem.*

The story of Procne, her sister Philomela, and the Thracian king Tereus (details: II 4, 21n.) is often used in comparisons. In St.: II 4, 21, III 3, 175-6, V 3, 83-4 (as an example of a trite story), *Th.* VIII 616, XII 478. The *tert. comp.* generally is lamenting, not, as here, cruelty. But see V 3, 84 *durae sorori* for Procne.

carpere: 'To destroy, to tear', *cf.* II 6, 79-80, V 1, 150 *carpitur Priscilla decorem*, 229. Here it alludes to Procne's cutting her son into pieces to cook him, *cf.* Sen. *Thy.* 1059-60 *artus...in parva carpsi frusta*, Petr. 36, 8 *qui*

obsonium carpit: Carpus vocatur. Ita quotienscumque dicit (sc. *Trimalchio*) *'carpe' eodem verbo et vocat et imperat*, Luc. II 120, Sen. *Dial.* V 18, 2, both referring to the laceration of Baebius.

141-2. Colchis: Medea, a frequent antonomy (see Carter under *Medea*), since Hor. *Epod.* 16, 58, e.g. Prop. II 1, 54, Ov. *Met.* VII 296, 331, 348, 394, Eur. *Med.* 133 τᾶς δυστάνου Κολχίδος. In St.: *Th.* IV 506, 551, *cf.* V 458.

She killed the two children of Jason and herself, and sent her rival Creusa, whom Jason wanted to marry, a poisoned mantle: Ov. *Ars* I 335-6 *cui non defleta est Ephyraeae flamma Creusae/ et nece natorum sanguinulenta parens*, the *Medeas* of Euripides and Seneca, Bömer on *Met.* VII 394 ff., *RE* VII 395, XI 1825.

She is called *torva* at Juv. 6, 43, Sid. *Carm.* 5, 132. But *fera* here alludes, I think, also to her barbarian origin, connecting her with the story of Procne which plays in barbarian Thrace.

durasset in: 'To harden or steel oneself (to actions, conditions, *etc.*)': *OLD* 4, see Petr. 105, 11 *crudeles manus in hoc supplicium durassent*, Sen. *Phaed.* 1262, Tac. *Ann.* I 6.

iras: Fierce deeds, like III 1, 44, *Th.* VI 745.

Aeolia...Creusa: Creusa, or Glauce (*RE locc. citt.*), was the daughter of the Corinthian king Creon, and thereby a descendant of Aeolus, the father of Sisyphus (not to be confused with the god of the winds), *cf.* Sen. *Med.* 105 *Aeoliam...virginem.* Sisyphus and Athamas both were sons of Aeolus: Sisyphus is called *Aeolides* at Hor. *Carm.* II 14, 20, *senis Aeolius*, Sen. *Phaed.* 1231, Athamas is *Aeolides* in *Th.* IV 571, Ov. *Met.* IV 512. This is one reason why Creusa is called *Aeolia*, to associate her with the next verse. The other reason is, of course, that St. wants to show his erudition. For his skill in finding various metonymies for persons and places: Heuvel on *Th.* I 183, 401, Mulder on *Th.* II 142 and II 2, 85-93n.

iste: *In bonam partem*: II 2, 110, II 7, 20, III 4, 34, III 5, 3, perhaps III 3, 48, e.g. Ov. *Ars* III 339.

143. Athamas: His story was treated by nearly every known tragedian, in Latin poetry notably in Ov. *Met.* IV 512 ff.: he and his wife Ino were struck with madness by Juno for educating Bacchus (98-9n.). Athamas kills his son Learchus, and Ino, pursued by him, jumps into the sea with her other son, Melicertes (180n.).

Here and elsewhere Athamas is represented as killing his son while hunting (*arcus*): *Th.* I 12 *cui sumpserit arcus infelix Athamas*, 230 with Heuvel's notes (scholiast: (*Athamas*) *qui furiata mente cum Learchum filium iugularet leonem se putavit occidere*), III 186-7, Hyg. *fab.* 4, 5 and 5, Apollod.

I 84. In Ovid's account Athamas thinks he is hunting: *retia tendite silvis* (513, *furibundus* 512 = *insanos* here). But he kills his son by dashing him against a stone, see Bömer on 512-9. In *Fast.* VI 490 the method of killing is not mentioned. See also *RE* XII 2297.

ab hoc: Markland, *ad hoc*: M, *ad hunc*: m (see Kl. *app.*, not in Mar. *ed.*). Clouard is the only one to read M's *ad hoc* translating '*à sa vue*' (with *flecteret* as *détourner*). Some older editions (the Bipontina for instance) read *ad hunc* and interpret as *cum eum conspiceret.* And some mss. have *adhuc* (Mar. *ed. app.*). But *flecteret* seems to need a complement, and *ab hoc* is a good solution. The same confusion occurs at I 3, 76, IV 6, 64, see Fr. 1943 XXVII.

arcus: The poetic plur. (Greek τόξα since Homer) also e.g. at *Th.* I 12, 658, IX 649, III 1, 134, often in Ov., e.g. *Am.* III 9, 8, 28, VFl. 686, *Ilias* 40, *al.*, since Prop. III 12, 35: Bednara 562, Schink 32.

insanos: *Th.* XI 230 *insano...cornu.*

144-5.: The story of Astyanax, thrown from the battlements of Troy by Ulysses is known in poetry after Homer, e.g. Eur. *Tro.* 704 ff., *Andr.* 8-11, Ov. *Met.* XIII 415 *mittitur Astyanax illis de turribus*, Sen. *Tro.* 1056 ff., esp. 1063 *missus e muris puer*, 1092 *turre*, 1098-9 (*puer*) *moverat vulgum ac duces ipsumque Ulixem, Silv.* V 3, 76-7 *Phrygia turre cadentem/ Astyanacta.*

quamquam: with part. or adj. occurs about 20 times in St., a little less often than with a predicate. In the *Silvae*: I 4, 19, III 3, 70, V 2, 103, V 3, 117.

This construction is frequent in Augustan prose and afterwards, but already found in Sallust and Livy: *LHSz.* 385, Krebs-Schmalz 403. It seems to be prosaic: neither of the two works quoted, nor *OLD* (4), give an example in poetry (except for one out of the *Th.* in *OLD*), but *quamvis* with part. occurs in Prop. I 15, 13, *quamlibet* with part. since Lucr. This may be connected with the word *quamquam* itself: it is not unpoetical, but avoided by all elegists and Sen. trag., and not frequent in Verg. and Hor. *Carm.* On the other hand the later elegies of Ov., VFl. and Sil. apparently like *quamquam.* All in all, its use is largely a question of personal taste: Axelson 123-4.

Hectoreos: 124-5n. St. uses both *Hectoris* and *Hectoreus* (3 times each) without apparent difference, but see II 4, 29n. *Hectoreus* is found since Cic. *poet.* 24.

cineres: 'Even though he was already dead'. An *Überbietung*, perhaps inspired by Ov. *Met.* XIII 426 *cineres secum tulit Hectoris.* For the plur.: 54-5n.

flesset missurus: It is only the context which makes clear that Ulysses would *not* have hurled him down: *missurus* 'on the point of throwing' (52n.) is not sufficiently clear, and *flere* is vague; it never implies 'to refrain from' (*TLL* VI[1] 899, 10 ff.). St., however, wants above all to picture Ulysses; compare Seneca's abstract *moverat* (*Tro.* 1098 above) with *flesset.*

Phrygius: Trojan, since Catul. 61, 18. In St.: I 2, 189, I 3, 87, III 1, 150, V 1, 57, V 2, 189, V 3, 39, *Th.* I 161, *al.*, Verg. *A.* I 618, Hor. *Carm.* II 9, 16, Ov. *Met.* XIII 721.

Somewhat less often St. uses *Phryx*: II 7, 48, III 1, 27, V 2, 48, *Ach.* I 361, *al. Phryx* for Trojan occurs since Prop. IV 1, 2 and Verg. *A.* XII 99, see Lunderstedt 42, *OLD.*

146-57.: The central and longest part of this description of Glaucias' death is concerned with the union of Glaucias and Melior: 149-53. This is made clear by the apostrophe to Melior (*te...te...tibi...tibi*), which sets off the passage from the rest. Its climax is the paradox *consolatur*: the dying boy comforts the survivor (153).

It is preceded by 3 lines describing Glaucias in the grip of death (146-7) with the cruel Parcae attacking him (148).

The end of the death-scene has already evoked a peaceful atmosphere of comfort, and this is continued in the third section of this description, where the cruelty of the Fates is forgotten and they are thanked for leaving Glaucias' beauty undamaged. See Newmyer 69-70 (with slight differences).

146-7. septima lux: The seventh day is considered the critical one in ancient medicine since Hippocrates: Censor. *Die natali* 11 *Hippocrates... aliique medici in corporum valetudinibus...septimum...diem* κρίσιμον *observant,* see Hipp. *Epid.* III 1 η´ (case 8) 180 and ια´ (case 11) 212 ἑβδομῇ ἀπέθανεν, III 2, ι´ (case 10) 224 ἑβδομῇ ῥᾳστώνη, *cf.* Roscher 1906 n° 6, 60-86, E.-F. 140 § 39. In funerary poetry: Ov. *Am.* II 6, 45 (parody), *cf.* Verg. *G.* IV 507 *septem menses Orpheus flet,* Ov. *Met.* X 73 *septem per dies cibo abstinet,* XIV 423 ff. *sex...noctes, totidem solis lumina* and then Canens metamorphoses.

The duration of the illness is also mentioned by St. at II 6, 79 (n.), V 3, 258-9, *cf.* Men. III 435, 20-1 *Sp.*

Ellipsis with an indication of time: III 3, 47, Ov. *Fast.* V 534 *decem menses: et puer ortus erat.* With indication of place: I 2, 144, *Th.* X 686.

frigentia lumina torpent: Death and (parts of the body of) the dead are conventionally chill, II *Praef.* 18, II 1, 172, III 3, 19-20 *animaeque supremum frigus, Th.* VIII 643, 734, IX 898, XI 600, XII 29, Lucr. III 401 *gelidos artus in leti frigore,* Verg. *G.* IV 525 *frigida lingua, A.* XI 817-8

frigida leto lumina, VFl. III 178-9 *frigidus orbes...somnus obit*. For many more parallels: Pease on *A*. IV 385.

'*Eine besonders starke Rolle spielen in den Sterbesszenen des Statius* [sc. *epicus*] *die Augen*', Blümner 1919, 267.

For *torpent*: V 3, 260 *torpor iners et mors*.

Infera Iuno: Proserpina: V 3, 277 *Aetnaea...Iuno, Th.* IV 526-7 *Stygiae...Iunonis*, Verg. *A*. VI 138 *Iunoni infernae* = *CE* 1551 G 1, *cf. Th.* V 156 *infera Ceres*. This kind of periphrase is esp. frequent for Hades: I 4, 94-5 *iniquo...Iovi, Th.* II 49 *nigri...Iovis*, Verg. *A*. IV 638 *Iovi Stygio*, Ov. *Fast.* V 448, Sil. I 386, II 674 *Tartareo Iovi*, VIII 116, *cf.* Sen. *Her.F.* 608 *Iuppiter dirus*.

Vergil seems to have introduced these periphrases in Latin poetry, imitating the Greeks (Homer, Aeschylus, others). They became popular in Flavian poetry. Another analogy is III 4, 18 *Iuppiter Ausonius... Romanaque Iuno* for Domitian and his wife. For the whole: Mulder on *Th.* II 49, Fr. 40 n. 1, Pease on *A*. IV 638.

crinem tenet: Proserpina or someone else cuts off a lock of hair from the dying person: Eur. *Alc.* 74, Verg. *A*. IV 698-9 *nondum illi flavum Proserpina vertice crinem abstulerat*, Hor. *Carm.* I 28, 19-20 *nullum saeva caput Proserpina fugit* (*pace* Kiessling-Heinze, see Nisbet-H.), Luc. VI 563 *comam laeva morienti abscidit ephebo* (the Thessalian witch, see 120-4n. on *dextra*).

The exact significance of the action is disputed, but it seems to symbolize the release of the soul from the body, and the taking possession by the powers of death, see Fr. 60 n. 6 and esp. Pease's extensive note on *A*. IV 698.

For the irony in *complexa*: 81, 121.

148-53.: The description of dying persons is a commonplace of Latin epic poetry, e.g. Verg. *A*. IV 688 ff., Ov. *Met.* XI 423-5, Luc. III 735 ff., VFl. VI 273-8, *cf.* also Blümner 1919. Allusions to the same topics in elegy: Tib. I 1, 59-60, Ov. *Ars* III 742 ff., *Tr.* III 3, 37-46.

In consolatory poetry: V 1, 170-5, 194-6, *cf.* II 5, 16-23, *Epic. Drusi* 89-98, *Eleg. Maec.* II 1 ff. All aspects which St. treats here can be paralleled from other poems, but see Blümner 1919, 269 '(*daß*) *Statius ... selbständiger und erfinderischer ist als Lucan, Silius Italicus und Valerius Flaccus...*' in his epic descriptions of dying persons. For medical and philosophic descriptions of the *facies Hippocratica*, the face of a dying person, see Schadel.

tamen: In spite of Proserpina's hold and the attack by the Fates.

fragiles...annos: *Fragilis* for the age of man is used **1)** of old age, e.g. Ov. *Tr.* IV 8, 3 *anni fragiles* = old age, *cf.* Cic. *Sen.* 65, Sil. XIV 85. **2)** Of

the human condition in general, often in Seneca, e.g. *Ep.* 98, 10, *cf. Th.* VIII 738 *fragilem hunc corporis usum,* Lucr. I 581. **3)** For women and children: Hier. *Ep.* 54, 13, 1 (women), *In Matth. 13, 57 fragilis infantiae,* Lact. *Inst.* V 13, 14 *sexus infirmus* (women) *et fragilis aetas* (children). The last meaning is not attested before Christian authors except for this vs., see *TLL* VI[1] 1228, 52 ff., 73 ff. St. seems to have extended use **2)**, and to be the first to use it specifically for children. Markland conjectured *faciles* (= *qui facile vincuntur*), because he only recognized use **1)**.

A similar adj. with *anni:* II 7, 54, III 3, 127 *florentis annos,* V 2, 13 *angustis annis.*

urguere: With abstract object: *Ach.* II 151 *pudorem,* Tib. I 9, 8 *opus terrae,* Ov. *Fast.* VI 520 *iter.*

te...videt...murmurat: The dying one only sees the survivor: V 1, 172-3, *Th.* VIII 647-54, Tib. I 1, 59 (a wish), Ov. *Met.* IV 145-6, VII 860, *Epic. Drusi* 92, Luc. III 737-8, Mart. VI 58, 5, *cf. Silv.* III 5, 37-9, VFl. III 326-7: Vollm., E.-F. 141 § 41C.

He speaks the name of the beloved: Ov. *Am.* II 6, 48 (the dying parrot cries to its mistress *Corinna, vale*), *Epic. Drusi* 308, Mart. *loc. cit., Th.* VIII 643-4, IX 349-50 *ultimus ille sonus moribundo emersit ab ore: 'mater!'*: E-F. *loc. cit.*

murmurare and cognates are often used by St. and Sil. for last words: *Th.* IX 131, X 276, 323, 440, Sil. IV 172, V 332, VII 608, Blümner 1919, 260, 267-8.

vultu moriente: In spite of his dying vision, *cf.* 146 *frigentia lumina.* Thus Priscilla's *optunsae aures* hear only her husband: V 1, 171. And the sight of him is able to retain her a moment from death: 171-3. See also 150-1 below *vacui...pectoris reliquias.*

For *vultus* = eyes: I 2, 14, II 6, 102, V 1, 170 *iamque cadunt vultus* (*cf.* III 5, 39 *oculos iam morte cadentes*).

lingua...cadente: Hor. *Carm.* IV 1, 36 *inter verba lingua silentio cadit, cadentes oculos* above and Sen. *Con.* II 4, 3.

in te...pectoris efflat reliquias: Catching the last breath of a dying person is often mentioned in literature: V 1, 195-6, V 5, 9, *Th.* XII 319, Cic. *Ver.* 5, 118 *nihil aliud orabant nisi ut filiorum suorum postremum spiritum ore excipere liceret, Epic. Drusi* 95-7 *miseranda parens suprema nec oscula legit... non animam apposito fugientem excepit hiatu,* Verg. *A.* IV 684-5. For many more parallels and literature see Pease there, also E.-F. 141 § 41H, Toynbee 1971, 43-4, Onians 171-3, Perella 4-10 (antiquity), 57-8, 177-8 and *passim* (later ages).

It may originally be a magic rite, keeping the soul or genius of the departed within the family (Pease, different: Onians), but Mau (1899, 347, 52 ff.) is probably right in saying that it was rather (felt as) merely a manifestation of love.

In spite of the frequency of this *topos*, St. tries each time to express himself paradoxically, stressing the borderline situation between life and death (II 5, 16-23n., 19-23n., *General Intr.* § 4). Here *vacui iam pectoris... reliquias* is *oxymoron* (or, if *vacui* is explained as a *prolepsis*, at the least a pointed juxtaposition), *cf.* the 'normal' use of *reliquias animae* and *reliquias vitae* in *Th.* VIII 725-6, XI 565-6. In III 3, 19 Etruscus is vainly looking for his father's *supremum frigus animae*, though *anima* by definition is not *frigus*. In V 5, 9 the dying boy holds Sts.' *anima*: *viscera nostra animamque tenens*, instead of *vice versa*. Likewise in V 1, 195-6 it is the dying Priscilla who plays the part of her surviving husband.

For similarities to *vacui...reliquias*, where something is described as both present and absent: II 2, 47 *exactam negat dimittere lucem*, II 5, 30 (n.), III 5, 40 *exhausti tempora fati* (but see Ov. *Ars* I 771, *Met.* V 149 and Bömer, *Fast.* V 387), V 1, 157 *exacti pars ultima fili*. See also II 2, 45-9n.

solum...exaudit: V 1, 171 above (on *vultu moriente*).

tibi...ora movet: = *tibi verba relinquit*. Last words are often mentioned: V 1, 176-93, *Epic. Drusi* 307-8, *Eleg. Maec.* II 1 ff., Prop. III 7, 57-64, Ov. *Met.* VIII 520, Sen. *Med.* 551-2, after death Prop. IV 7, 13-94, IV 11. In prose Tac. *Ag.* 45, 3, Hier. *Ep.* 39, 1: E.-F. 142 § 42.

relinquit: 'To leave behind', *cf.* V 1, 177-8 *cui linquere possem o utinam...annos*, also for inheritances: *OLD* 8b. Therefore conjectures (*requirit*: Postg., *retemptat*: Saenger; both hesitant proposals) are not needed.

prohibet gemitus consolaturque dolentem: Paradoxically, the dying boy plays the part of the comforter, see above, V 1, 179-80 *parce, precor, lacrimis, saevo ne concute planctu pectora* = *prohibet gemitus*, 181-93 = *consolatur*, Prop. IV 11, 77, 79-80, Quint. *Inst.* VI *Praef.* 11 *ut me in supremis consolatus est.*

In the last resort the argument is that the grief of the survivor torments the other one: V 1, 180 *nec crucia...coniugis umbram*. Therefore it also occurs in the *consolatio* proper: II 6, 93, 96, Hor. *Carm.* II 9, 9-10, *Epic. Drusi* 467-8, *Eleg. Maec.* II 16, *CE* 963, 12, 965, 7-8 *quid...opus est...cineres sollicitare meos*, 995, 19 ff., 1198, 11 ff., *cf.* Men. 414, 21 *Sp.* καὶ τάχα που καὶ μέμφεσθαι τοῖς θρηνοῦσι (sc. ὁ μεταστάς). Outside consolatory poetry: Tib. I 1, 67, Prop. IV 11, 1. See Vollm. on II 6, 93, E.-F. 142 § 42 B.a, Nisbet-H. on Hor. *Carm.* II 9, 9-10. See 226-34n.

consolari occurs only here in St. It is very rare in poetry, rare also in prose: not in Tib., Prop., Verg., Luc., Pers., Grat., VFl., Sil., Mart., Juv., once in Catul., Hor. sat. and St. Only Ovid has it 8 times. Elsewhere St. uses *solari*, and he has it much more often than other poets[34]. This is not due to his subject, for it occurs only twice in a *con-*

[34] 27 times according to *TLL* IV 479, 26-31, 28 times + 1 according to the Concordance and Fr. on II *Praef.* 25.

solatio: V 1, 176 and V 3, 31. Vergil and Ovid lead the rest with 14 instances each, 6 in VFl. and Sil., not in Lucan: *TLL* IV 479, 26-31.

For the *topos*: V 1, 176 *moriens solatur amantem.*

153-7.: *Consolatur* has evoked two arguments of the consolation: Glaucias did not suffer a long time. And therefore his beauty had not diminished when he died.

For the first argument: V 3, 258-9 *nec segnis labe senili exitus.* Menander (435, 20 *Sp.*, in a totally different context) commends a mention if death was either sudden or expected, *cf.* Dion. 29, 15 *Us.*

That the beauty of the deceased is preserved is a typically Statian argument (36-136n. on *decus*; contrast Sil. XII 243 ff. *solvitur omne decus leto*): V 1, 228-30 Priscilla is preserved from decay by embalming, *Th.* VII 696-8, X 26 *integri...auguris umbram* (see Williams), XII 338-9 *gratum est, Fortuna,...totos invenimus artus, CE* 1522, 13 *sed integer iuventa...inviolatus artus...hoc situs est in agro*: Vollm., E.-F. 153 § 75 (II 4, 36-7 which he includes under the same heading is wrongly interpreted, see note there).

The thought hiding behind this praise of unviolated beauty is that the corpse after death keeps the same appearance as at the moment of dying, from Homer onward (*Od.* XI 40): the ghost of Laius in *Th.* II, esp. 8, 124-5, IV 569, 590, 593-4, see Mulder on *Th.* II 8, Smith on Tib. I 10, 37-8 ('This naïve idea is universal'), Norden on *A.* VI 446. Here St. may have imitated Verg. *A.* II 270 ff., where Hector appears to Aeneas in a dream, just as he was when Aeneas last saw him, *cf.* 274 *qualis erat* and 157 below. Other instances of this idea: e.g. Tib. II 6, 39-40, Prop. IV 7, 7 ff., Verg. *A.* VI 495, Sil. XIII 824-5, Vérilhac no. 92 (3rd/2nd cent. B.C.), a child which was hit by a stone: ἐν δ' Αΐδῃ τραῦμα κακὸν φορέω.

gratum est: 'Thank you': *OLD* 2d, Liv. III 46, 8 *ille lacrimabundus 'gratum est' inquit; 'crastina die vestra opera utar'*, Sen. *Med.* 553, Sil. VI 584.

tamen: The adversative particle is also typical of the *consolatio* proper, see II 4, 33-4n.

iacentis: *Iacere*, 'to lie ill': II 6, 77, V 5, 19, Cels. III 19, 3 *imbecillitati iacentis cibo...succurrere, OLD* 2c. It is also used in similar contexts for 'to lie dead' (see *OLD* 6): 173, *Th.* V 536, 554, VI 195, 246, see *iacuit* 180 here.

exedit: III 1, 111 *non unquam exesus ab aevo*, Sen. *Ag.* 764 *exesa ilia*, Sil. II 466 *exesis genis.*

puerile decus: = III 4, 31 (Earinus, who is alive), see *formaque aevoque* 178.

subivit: This is the only time that St. uses a form with *-ivi-* for the perfect tense of *ire* and its compounds. Elsewhere he employs the forms in *-ii*: *subiit Th.* I 126, III 415, X 25, *Silv.* I 2, 28, *subii Th.* XI 76, *subiisse*

Th. I 780, *cf. subiere* 6 times. Or he uses the contracted forms: *subit* II 3, 13, IV 3, 130, V 1, 258, *subisti Th.* XI 678, *Silv.* I 4, 93, V 2, 105, *subistis Th.* VII 381, *subisset* X 814. For other compounds of *ire*: Vollm. on V 2, 12.

The perfect in *-v-* of *ire* and all its compounds is, in fact, extremely rare in Latin: Neue-W. III³ 432, 435, 439-40, 448-9, 451 and *TLL* I 66, 16-7; 616, 77-9; V² 626, 81; VII 1294, 72; IX² 45, 64-7. Between Plautus and the 4th century there is (as far as can be ascertained) only one occurrence in poetry: Verg. *A.* VI 801 *obivit.* In prose it is found once in Cato, Curt. Ruf., Sen., Florus, 6 times in Apul., 4 in Gel. (2 of which are quotations), often in the Vulgate. It seems to be archaic; see Norden on *A.* VI 801, where the context is dithyrambic and the compound *septemgeminus* is also very unusual for Vergil.

Therefore, I think *subibit* must be read instead of *subivit.* There may be one additional argument: perhaps the temporal sequence of this poem is not a very reliable index: 1-36n., 76-8n. But in 187 Glaucias is represented as not yet in Elysium *navita...subibit...litora*; note also the three future tenses *latrabit...terrebit..subibit.* Both Philetus in II 6, 98 (*subit ille pios*) and Priscilla in V 1, 258 (*sic manes Priscilla subit*) are described as entering Elysium after the funeral.

-iv- and *-ib-* are esp. often confused in inscriptions: *TLL* V² 626, 81. And interchange of *v* and *b* is, of course, very common generally, e.g. I 1, 54, II 7, 29, 44, see Markland on I 4, 61, Baehrens on I 4, 65.

integer et nullo temeratus...damno: The same thing twice. For the ending: *Ach.* I 302 *nullo temeratus pectora motu.*

corpora: The poetic plural is usual since Ovid (e.g. *Am.* II 10, 24, *Ars* I 728). Before him Cic *poet.* has it 3 times, but only for constellations. It is perhaps twice found in Tib. (I 2, 25a, I 8, 52), certainly once in Sulpicia (III 17, 2) and thrice in the *Culex.* It is probably an analogy of *pectora* (17-8n.): Bednara 556, Maas 537n., Schink 141-3.

qualis erat: An emphatic and moving enjambment. Similar instances are rare in *Silv.* II: II 1, 229 and II 6, 70 (n.), where *laedendi vias* is both the end of the sentence and of the pericope, are the best examples. Less forceful enjambments are II 2, 72, 129, II 4, 7, 25 (see also II 6, 42-3n.). This means that, *if* St. imitated *qualis erat* from Vergil (above), he infused it with a pathos of his own.

qualis erat occurs also in *Th.* X 204, about Amphiaraüs in the Underworld (enjambment, but the sentence runs on), *cf.* VII 820 *sicut erat...defert in Tartara currus.* Vollm. quotes some other parallels under *auctores* (*Th.* IV 314, *cf.* III 336, *Silv.* II 6, 34, V 3, 215), where the context is different.

157-82. FUNUS: Always important in St.: II 4, 33-7, II 6, 85-93, III 3, 131-7, something like it 195-204, V 1, 208-46, not in V 3, *Th.* VI 54-248. Its main characteristics are: great luxury, and the grief of the survivor, who wants to commit suicide (24-5n.). The luxury is exemplified in the use of costly spices and gifts. Its purpose is to show the survivor's wealth and generosity, and because *parvi...augescunt funere manes* (*Th.* VI 71). The description of the funeral assures the bereaved that he has done his duty, or more (Newmyer 70), *cf.* Men. III 421, 32-4 *Sp.*

A first section is formed by 157-65, describing the costly gifts. It opens with a rhetorical question (96n.), is punctuated by persistent *quod* (56-66n.), and ends with a *pointe* showing how rich and generous Melior is.

The second part (166-74) treats of Melior's grief, closing with the theme that he is more distressed than Glaucias' own parents (*Intr.*, 23-5n., 72-105n.).

175-8, introduced by *quid mirum* (69-72n., 96n.), extend the mourning over the whole of Rome, to heighten the pathos already apparent in *immeritus, tristibus, infans, formaque aevoque* (19-21n., 36-136n.). This third and last part is closed by two vividly pictorial mythological comparisons (see 88-102n. for their closure-function), with a faint hint of immortality (note there).

There are structural analogies to II 6, 85 ff. and V 1, 208 ff.: *Introductory statement* 157-8, II 6, 85-6, V 1, 208-10. *Luxury*, closing with a *pointe*: 157-65, II 6, 86-90, V 1, 210-16 (no *pointe*). *Grief of the survivor*: 166-73, II 6, 90-3, V 1, 216-21. The closing comparisons do not occur in II 6 and V 1.

The whole is characterized by Sts.' rich vocabulary: *dona* (158) = *munera* (165), *census* (163) = *opes* (164), *flammis* (157) = *ardentia funera* (158) = *rogus* (159, 167) = *aggere* (159, see note) = *ignis* (164), *flores* = *graminis* (160), *cf.* *liquores* (161), *non capit* (164) = *desunt* (165), *hilaris* = *comis* (169) = *placidissime* (167), *saevae* = *barbarus* (169) = *torvus* (171).

157-8. dona loquar: M has *dana loquor. Dona* is a correction in M[1], *loquar*: Domitius. Vollm., Postg., Fr., Mar., Sb. keep *loquor.* But the subjunctive must be right: see the instances of *quid referam* (96n. and Cancik quoted there), e.g. *Th.* IX 799 *quid plura loquar*, II 2, 98 *quid dicam*, Håk. 51. Traglia inappropriately quotes II 7, 79 as a parallel (ed. *app. crit.*), which is fut. tense (but Traglia-Aricò translate as a subj.: '*che parlare*').

dona are presents, perhaps also possessions of Glaucias, see *Th.* VI 66 ff., *munera* 73, 126-8, 168, V 1 209 *dona malae feralia pompae. Luxu* is more specifically the spices, *purpureo aggere* (159) is a mound of tapestries:

Th. VI 62-3 *summa crepant auro Tyrioque attollitur ostro/ molle supercilium* and Fortgens, 208 *pictis exsudat vestibus aurum*, V 1, 214 *Tyrio... umbrata tegmine*, Verg. *A.* VI 221-2 *purpureasque super vestes, velamina nota, coniciunt* and Norden, Luc. IX 175-8, Sil. X 570-1.

prodiga flammis dona: The position of *flammis* indicates that these words belong together. The problem is how. *Dona flammis*, gifts to the flames, without *data* or the like would be very unusual. The nearest parallel is *Th.* X 344-5 *tot ditia dona sacratis postibus exige*, where the dative is rather one of advantage; in VIII 209-10 *flammas ac dona rogo tristesque rependant exsequias, rogo* belongs to *rependant.*

Vollm., Mozl., Fr. and Traglia-Ar. explain *flammis* as a dat. with *prodigus*: 'flung prodigally', '*prodigués*'. But *prodigus* with a dative is nowhere attested, nor does it ever bear a passive sense (see the dictionaries of Forcellini, Freund, *OLD*, which mentions this passage under '(of gifts) extravagant, wasteful', but omits *flammis.* There is one instance of *prodigus* with *in* + acc., *libidines in cibos...prodigae* (Gel. XIX 2, 3), which is no parallel for the dat. here.

I rather think that *flammis* is an abl. here: *prodigus*, 'wasteful of', usually has the gen. with it (*OLD* 1a, b, 2), but an abl. occurs at *Mor.* 35 *cruribus exilis spatiosa prodiga planta*, Tac. *Ann.* XV 35 *prodigum largitionibus*, Plin. *Nat.* IX 67 *Asinius Celer, hoc pisce prodigus, unum mercatus octo milibus nummum.* Then *dona flammis prodiga* means: 'gifts lavish with the flames', i.e. gifts needing much fire to burn them up, many gifts. These gifts squander the flames as Melior squanders his gifts: *prodigus* 162. In 164-5 the same thing is expressed the other way round.

funera: One would automatically assume that by *funera* St. refers to the pyre, and the translators translate accordingly. But that meaning is not attested in *TLL* (VI^1 1600, 28 ff.). Therefore we must explain it by 'corpse', see 22n. and Mart. X 71, 6 *arserunt uno funera bina rogo.*

159-62. quod: Perhaps *loquor...exsequias...* <*loquor*> *quod.* In late Latin a *verbum sentiendi* or *declarandi* is sometimes followed by *quod*, instead of *ACI*: K.-St. II 274-5, Ernout-Thomas § 305, *LHSz.* 576-7. In classical Latin sometimes *quod* occurs as the explanation of a preceding pronoun, e.g. *hōc...quod.* One of these cases may be a parallel: Caes. *Gal.* I 23, 3 *pauca apud eos loquitur, quod sibi gratia non relata sit*, where *quod* explains *pauca* (K.-St. *loc. cit.*). Then *quod* here explains and specifies *exsequias.*

On the other hand, *TLL* gives no example of *quod* following *loquor* under '*syntactica et stilistica notabiliora*' (VII^2 1668, 50-1672, 62). For *dico quod* it gives only two examples from before the 2nd cent. A.D., and none at all from poetry (nor do the handbooks of syntax quoted above offer any poetical instance for a *verbum sentiendi* or *declarandi* with *quod*). That

this construction is vulgar can also be concluded from its first instance, *renuntiarunt quod*: *B. Hisp.* 36, 1, see *LHSz. loc. cit.* It seems improbable that St. thought of *loquor quod* when composing. We probably must conclude that St. had in mind common constructions like *addo quod, non commemoro quod,* which also occur in poetry (*LHSz. loc. cit.*), when he wrote this loose *quod.*

The use of spices at cremations had existed for a long time already in Rome: when Sulla was cremated masses of spices were burnt, so a tradition probably existed by then (Plut. *Sulla* 38). Spices in this context are mentioned in II 1, 21, II 4, 34-6, II 6, 86-8, III 3, 33-5, 132, V 1, 210-4, 230-1, *Th.* VI 59-61, 209-10, Prop. II 13, 23, IV 7, 33, Tib. I 3, 7, [Tib.] III 2, 23-4 (Lygdamus), Ov. *Pont.* I 9, 52-3, *Epic. Drusi* 188, see *SG* II^{10} 361-2, Blümner 1911, 501, E.-F. 144 § 44C, 146 § 46I. This custom of burning spices together with the body is typically Roman (not Greek): Robert 1960, 340-2, *cf.* 333 n. 6, 342 n. 3.

However, apart from Lygdamus, all authors just mention one spice in this context (for enumeration of more spices, always in other contexts, see Bömer on Ov. *Fast.* I 339 ff.). This suggests that St. is influenced by the customs of his time, when spices held an important place, *cf.* Mart. III 12, 4-5 *qui non cenat et unguitur...mihi mortuus videtur,* X 97, 2, XI 54, 1, Juv. 4, 108-9 *sudans Crispinus amomo quantum vix redolent duo funera,* Lilja 87-90 and *passim.* Moreover, St. probably is personally interested in these exotic and sumptuous goods, *cf.* Lilja 219 'By far the most interested of the ancient poets in describing the sweet scents connected with funerals.' It is difficult to see why Sts.' descriptions of spices at the cremation should be 'purely rhetorical', as Lohrisch (107-8) claims.

The evocative geographical names suggest that the whole world lies open to Melior's riches, and that it has gathered especially for small Glaucias (or Melior's parrot in II 4, Philetus in II 6, Priscilla in V 1). This is a variant on the *topos* 'the whole city came to mourn one boy' (20, 175-6). Both are instances of the juxtaposition 'one/many', 'great/small': 124-36n., 175-8n., II 2, 76-85n.

Sometimes the adjectives which St. employs for the spices are rather vague, *Assyrius* for instance (II 4, 34-6n.). But he can also be very specific, like *Cinyrea* (for myrrh V 1, 214), *Sicanius* (Sicilian, for saffron) II 4, 36, V 3, 41. I think we must assume that in these enumerations every item stands for one specific product, until we are forced to admit the contrary.

Cilicum flores: Saffron from Cilicia, also mentioned in II 6, 87, III 3, 34 *messes Cilicum,* V 1, 211 *ver Cilicum,* 214 *Coryciae...comae* (after Corycus, a mountain of Cilicia). Cilician saffron was the best kind: Strabo XIV 5, 5, Plin. *Nat.* XXI 31 *prima nobilitas Cilicio et ibi in Coryco*

monte; dein Lycio...mox Centuripino Siciliae. It is mentioned already at Hor. *S.* II 4, 68. St. refers to Sicilian saffron in II 4, 36, V 3, 41, *Th.* VI 210 *pallenti...croco.*

The first place where saffron is mentioned in connection with funerals is a Lycian decree of 43 A.D., where a rich Roman lady receives a funeral-gift (while she is still alive) of 5 *mna* saffron (about 3 kilos): Robert 1960, 324-42. It was very expensive, because the harvest required much care, and was counterfeited more than any other herb: Plin. *loc. cit.* On its uses otherwise than in cremations, see Robert's exhaustive treatment, *cf.* André 1956, 105-6.

graminis Indi: *Indorum seges* V 1, 212, *Indum gramen olentes Th.* VII 569: *putchuk*, in Latin *costum* (*Saussurea lappa*): André 1956, 103, Marquardt 783, 785, Moldenke 218-9, Miller 84-6, *TLL* IV 1085, 65 ff. It is a tall perennial herb growing in Kashmir and the Punjab, and its Latin name is derived from Skt. kushṭha/kushṭum. It was already known by Theophrastus, *Hist. plant.* IX 7, 3, *De odor.* 32, and in Latin since Prop. IV 6, 5 and Hor. *Carm.* III 1, 44 *Achaemenium costum.* The root was put to many uses: it was burnt in religious ceremonies (Plin. *Nat.* XXII 118, Luc. IX 917, still in use in Indian temples), used in ointments (Plin. *Nat.* XIII 18, XIV 107, XXI 76) and medicines (*TLL* IV 1086, 1 ff.), for spicing wine (Theophr. *De odor.* 32, Col. XII 20, 5) and food (Miller 84-5). St. seems to be the only one to mention it in connection with cremations. Though places of provenance other than India are sometimes mentioned by ancient writers, this is based on ignorance and shows that Syria and Arabia were trading-stations for it (André *loc. cit.*, Miller 85).

For *munera graminis*: *Th.* IV 452 *munera verni lactis.*

gramen is used of plants in general and spices in particular, not only grassy plants: II 4, 35, II 6, 88, Prop. II 29, 17 *Arabum de gramine odores*, Verg. *A.* XII 415.

Arabes...liquores: (oil of) myrrh: III 3, 34 *messes Arabum*, V 1, 211 *ver Arabum* = 214 *Cinyrea...germina*, Prop. II 29, 17 *Arabum de gramine odores* (exuding from Cynthia's hair, see Enk *ad loc.*), Ov. *Ep.* 15, 76, Apul. *Met.* II 9 *guttis Arabicis obunctus* (sc. *capillus*).

It was mainly used in ointments and as a perfume. St. seems to be the first to mention it at the funeral[35].

In antiquity Arabia is most often mentioned as the home of myrrh (Herod. III 107, Theophr. *Hist. plant.* IX 4, 2-9, Plin. *Nat.* XII 66, see *RE* XVI 1134-46, André 1956, 215, Moldenke 82-4). Though a 19th-century expedition in fact has found myrrh trees in Arabia, near Yemen,

---

[35] *RE* XVI 1143 quotes [Tib.] III 2, 24 (Lygdamus), but that does not belong here.

its real home is Africa, esp. Somalia, the ancient land of Punt, and most myrrh came from there: Miller 104-5, *cf.* Plin. *Nat.* XII 68.

Pharii...liquores: Vollm., Lohrisch (107-8) and Fr. (61 n. 1) explain as *unguenta Aegyptiaca*, without further elucidation. It just might refer to an ointment mentioned in Theophr. *De odor.* 28, αἰγύπτιον, which was prepared with myrrh, cinnamon and other spices, see *RE* III 1648. But *TLL* under *Aegyptius* gives no instance of such a word or concept in Latin, and apparently this ointment is unknown to Latin authors.

I rather think St. means cinnamon, *cinna(mo)mum* in Latin: André 1956, 91, *RE* III 1637-50, *TLL* III 1076, 35 ff., Miller 153-72. In II 6, 88-9 St. calls it *Phariae exempta volucri cinnama, Th.* VI 61 *ab antiquo durantia Belo* (Belus is the mythical father of Aegyptus: *RE* III 259-64), both at the cremation. Cinnamon is sometimes considered as coming from Arabia: IV 5, 31, V 3, 42 *Sabaei*, see *RE loc. cit.* But until the time of Pliny classical writers held that it grew in Ethiopia and the Sudan (wrongly, for its natural habitat is South-East Asia, see esp. Miller *loc. cit.*): Herod. III 111, Strabo II 5, 7, 34, Plin. *Nat.* XII 86 *nascitur in Aethiopia.* In Egypt it was appreciated already *c.* 1450 B.C. and was essential in embalming (Miller 154), which may explain *liquores*, but see also below. If I am right, it is probably the story about the Phoenix, *Pharia volucris*, which prompted St. to his periphrase here (II 6, 88, esp. II 4, 34-6n.). Cinnamon occurs in enumerations of spices at Ov. *Ep.* 15, 333, *Met.* X 307, *cf.* Mela III 79.

Palaestini...liquores: *Palaestini* is Selden's conjecture (or possibly Barth's, see van Dam 386) for M's *palam est vidique*, made 24 years later independently by Salmasius (*Solin. Exerc.* 400).

It refers to *opobalsamum*, balsam, the gum of the balsam tree: III 2, 138 *dulce nemus florentis Idymes*, V 1, 213 *Palaestini...liquores*, André 1956, 228-9, Moldenke 84-6, *RE* XVIII[1] 691-6, Miller 101-2. Pliny mentions it as the most exclusive and expensive of perfumes: *Nat.* XII 111 *sed omnibus odoribus praefertur balsamum*, see the rest of his description up to 123. It is first mentioned in Latin at Verg. *G.* II 119. Its main uses were in medicine and as a perfume; in funerals only here.

Romans associated *opobalsamum* with Judaea: the Royal Gardens in Jerusalem and Jericho were traditionally planted with seedlings of *opobalsamum* brought to Solomon by the Queen of Sheba. In 70, after Titus' triumph over the Jews, when branches of this tree were first seen in Rome, these gardens were systematically exploited by Rome. It was probably also imported from Southern Arabia: Miller *loc. cit.*

Next to the spices mentioned here, St. also names *amomum*: II 4, 34, II 6, 88, frankincense: II 1, 21, II 6, 86, V 1, 213, V 3, 43, *Th.* VI 61.

For *liquor* = *unguentum*: Lunderstedt 50. St. seems to be the first to use this metonomy. In the same way he employs *sucus* for *unguentum* in I 3, 10, *Th.* VI 209 (with Fortgens).

arsuram lavere: Pointedly juxtaposed. For washing and anointing the body after death, see Verg. *A.* VI 219 with Austin's note. Already in Enn. *Ann.* 155 (V.) *Tarquinium bona femina lavit et unxit.* Also poignant since anointing the hair was a custom of young men perfuming themselves: Blümner 1911, 272, 435-6, Nisbet-H. on Hor. *Carm.* I 5, 2.

162-5. succendere census: A quasi-etymological pun, giving the effect of a jingle, reinforced by *cupit...non capit.* Similarly III 3, 148 *totoque volens excedere censu.* St. sometimes (but not nearly so often as Sidonius for instance) plays with these Latin etymologies: I 1, 4-6 *effigies...effinxere*, I 2, 267 *leges...legant*, I 3, 53 *necopinus opes*, II 6, 76 *videndo...invidia*, see Vollm. on I 1, 6. Much more frequently a Latin word alludes to a Greek concept, see 187-8n., II 2, 36-42n.

desertas...invidus: Melior hates his riches, because they are deserted by Glaucias, as he is himself (*cf.* 166-74). Grief is responsible for this change in his behaviour, for, in general, he handles money in exactly the right manner: II 3, 70-1, *cf.* 55-66n.

Invidus is an unusual term for *ignis*, see *TLL* VII^2 211, 33 ff. where only *CE* 2126, 4 is mentioned: *eripuit...invida flamma preces.* The fire is Melior's enemy, *invidus* (see 120-4n., 170 *iniquam*), hostile to Melior because it burns what is dearest to him, but also because it grudges what he desires most of all, to devour the gifts. Melior and the fire are opposed in *cupit/ non capit, prodigus/ invidus, omnia, totos/ artae.* The thought that the fire is *invidus* because it grudges Glaucias his *munera* (Vollm.) is, I think, secondary. Apart from all this, an important implication is, of course, that Melior is so rich and generous that the fire is simply unable to burn all the gifts.

For the apostrophe: 166-8n.

non capit ignis: A verse ending with a monosyllable in the 5th foot followed by two dissyllables occurs only 3 times in the *Silvae*: here, II 3, 21, and III 4, 29 *non erat illi/*: Cancik *Forschungsbericht* § 3.2.2B, Mart. VII 27, 9 *noster te non capit ignis* (a giant boar). It may be supposed that *non* here and in III 4 and *per* in II 3 are considered as enclitics, so that the monosyllable + dissyllable are experienced as one word of three syllables.

desunt in: *Deesse in* is rare: Cato *Agr.* 2, 6, Liv. XXII 60, 4, *cf.* *deesse ad usum* Caes. *Civ.* II 96, 2, Sen. *Ben.* II 10, 1, IV 10, 5. The usual complement is a dative, *Th.* I 218 *desunt incudibus ignes*, schol. *ad fulmina fabricanda ignis non posse sufficere*: *TLL* V^1 779, 55-7, *cf.* 25.

166. Horror habet sensus: *Th.* III 549 *terror habet vates*, VIII 4 *horror habet cunctos.*

For *sensus*, 'heart', like *cor, animus*: III 5, 16 *corde...aut...sensus, Th.* X 677 *erexit sensus*, 'a variation...on the common *erigere animum*': Williams, *OLD* 6c.

I write a colon after *sensus*, because *Horror...* begins a new section; what follows on *qualem* explains *horror.* The only edition to print a colon instead of a full stop is Clouard's.

Horror... introduces the theme of Melior's grief. St. describes the survivor's despair at the funeral also in II 6, 89-93, III 3, 176-94, V 1, 216-20, *cf.* III 3, 135-7. Outside the *Funus*: 23-4, III 3, 6-12, 17-21, V 3, 31-2. Other poets: Ov. *Am.* III 9, 50-8, *Epic. Drusi* 259-94, *cf.* 85, 88 (*Funus*); Tib. I 1, 61-8, [Tib.] III 2, 9-30, Prop. II 13, 27-30 (outside *Funus*); *cf.* Tib. II 4, 43-50: E.-F. 144 § 45.

Parallels for '*Trauersitten*' from all times and cultures are given by Meuli 324-74, 387 ff., 823-4, 925-30, esp. 324-31. His explanation of psychological factors as the main-spring of the ubiquitous manifestations of excessive grief is convincing: the survivor experiences both love and guilt and feels that the dead one and the rest of the community must be persuaded by the violence of his mourning that he is innocent of this death. A key-concept is that of melancholy, originally real in some instances, feigned in ritual as the cause of the '*Trauersitten*', see esp. 333-53. See also Versnel 1980, 578 ff., who puts the idea into a wider context, and *Intr.* here.

166-8. Qualem te...extimui: Meaning *Qualis eras! Te extimui!*, see III 5, 37-9 *qualem te...aspexi*, V 1, 108-110, *Th.* IX 162 *qualem lapsare in sanguine vidi* (sc. *Adrastum*), XII 322-4 *hunc...te...adspicio.*

funere summo: 'The climax of the funeral'. For this sense of *summus*, 'the (fatal) culmination', 'the most intense moment of': Cic. *Ver.* 4, 86 *erat hiems summa, tempestas...perfrigida, Fam.* XIII 60, 2 *hieme summa, Phil.* 5, 46, *Flac.* 6 *in summo et periculosissimo rei publicae tempore, cf.* Verg. *A* II 324 *summa dies*, 'the fatal day', Luc. VII 195 *venit summa dies, geritur res maxima.*

Vollm. thinks that St. means the moment when Glaucias' body was put on top of the pyre. That implies (and so do 172-3) that St. does not describe the funeral in chronological order: first *desunt...flammae,* then *premis visus.*

Melior: In this last climax of grief Melior's name is mentioned twice (also 167), to heighten the pathos. That St. does not apostrophize him here accidently is suggested because names are only mentioned in two other verses of this poem: Melior himself in 1, and Glaucias toward the end of the poem (229). See also 52-4n. (*tibi*), 102-5n.

placidissime quondam: Together with *hilaris* is in contrast with *animi saevaeque manus* (169)...*torvus* (171). *Comis...videri* is contrasted with *barbarus horror* (169)...*vestes et pectora rumpis* (171). *Placidissime* is also pointedly juxtaposed with *extimui*, see e.g. II 5, 13 *placidi intumuere*, Mart. I 22, 1-2 *saeva...placidi...ora.*

Melior himself is called *placidus* in II 3, 15, *cf.* 64. It is a word St. likes to use for his friends: I 2, 201 (Stella), 3, 22 (Vopiscus), II 2, 9 (Pollius), III 1, 179 (Polla), 3, 43 (Etruscus), IV 8, 57 (Menecrates), *cf.* III 3, 167 *ductor placidissime*, 'lover of peace', for Domitian.

ille hilaris comisque videri: 'The man who was so merry and kind to regard'. For *hilaris*: 56-7n.

comis videri: The passive inf. instead of supine II is a construction which follows Greek examples. It occurs in poetry; in prose it is rare, apart from *facilis* + inf.: *LHSz.* 351. For *videri*: IV 6, 37 *parvus videri, Th.* V 40 *maior videri* (= Verg. *A.* VI 49, Ov. *Met.* VII 639, IX 269), 136 *videri clara*, VI 843-4 *videri exiguus*, Hor. *Carm.* I 19, 8 *lubricus aspici*, IV 2, 59 *niveus videri.* Other passive infinitives: *Th.* III 42 *dubius notari*, X 759 *manifestus nosci*, XI 397 *difficiles relinqui, Silv.* I 6, 67 *faciles emi*, Prop. IV 8, 40, Tac. *Hist.* IV 39.

For instances of adjectives followed by an active inf. in St.: Mulder on *Th.* II 573, 663, Williams on X 234. Clement LXXIII-IV gives a complete account of all words which have an inf. as a complement.

Hilaris can be followed by inf. in St., but only active infinitives are found: *Th.* IX 698 *hilaris iactare, Ach.* I 559 — *sedere.* So we can better take the inf. as depending only on *comis.* St. is the only one to use this construction with *comis*: *TLL* III 1786, 17. His visual attitude is illustrated because *comis* only rarely refers to someone's outward appearance: Hor. *S.* I 4, 90 *hic tibi comis et urbanus liberque videtur* is probably nearest, and there *comis* does not really denote appearance (*TLL loc. cit.*, see 36-136n., 131-5n.).

169-72. animi saevaeque manus: *Saevae* is probably to be interpreted *apo koinou* with *animi* and *manus,* as Vollm. says, see *Th.* XI 465-6 *saevis...animis*, 'wild frenzy'. *Animi*, though, can sometimes be interpreted as 'frenzy' without *saevus*: *Th.* VIII 406-7 *rabies et vitae prodiga virtus emisere animos*, XI 369.

manus...horror: Concrete details again (92-3n.). *Horror* here means 'uncouthness' (*OLD* 3a), specifically with regard to Melior's hair, I think, *cf.* II 6, 43(n.), *Th.* VIII 389 *horrore comarum*, X 606, Apul. *Apol.* 4 *capillus horrore implexus atque impeditus.* Note that St. uses the same word with a different sense within 3 verses (167), *cf.* 47-8n., II 2, 68-72n., II 3, 22-3n.

barbarus: σ, *barbaris*: M.

modo...nunc: 131-5n.

lucem aversaris iniquam: Explains *fusus humi*: Melior turns away from the light of day by throwing himself upon the ground. Hereby he signifies that he wants to die, for light symbolizes life: 78-81n., Sen. *Dial.* VI 3, 3 (if you persist in your grief) *invisa haerebis in luce.*

That the survivor is tired of life is also mentioned in *Th.* VI 175, *Epic. Drusi* 104, 164, 323; in other *genres*: Verg. *A.* IX 493 ff., Ov. *Tr.* I 3, 99: E.-F. 145 § 45H. More often St. explicitly mentions the desire to commit suicide: 23-5n., E.-F. *loc. cit.* I.

torvus: II 6, 40-1n.

vestes et pectora rumpis: Beating the breast as a sign of mourning is an ancient custom and a literary *topos*, since Homer (e.g. *Il.* XXII 464). In descriptions of the funeral: III 3, 176-7, *Th.* VI 178, Ov. *Am.* II 6, 3 (parody), III 9, 10. Outside these descriptions: 27-8, III 3, 8, V 1, 179-80, V 5, 16-7, *Th.* VI 133-4, Prop. II 13, 27 *pectus lacerata*, and often elsewhere: E.-F. 145 § 45C, *RE* III 353, 39 (Mau), Strehlein 66 (Greek tragedy).

Pectora rumpere seems a creative imitation by St.: It echoes Ov. *Ars* III 707-8 *tenues a pectore vestes/ rumpit.* Thus St. employs *vestes...rumpit.* But he writes *pectora* with it, in the sense 'to tear open', see *Th.* VI 865-6 *rumpunt...pectora* (867 *vulnera sanat*). But *pectora rumpere* suggests also 'to kill': Verg. *A.* IX 431-2 *ensis...costas et...pectora rupit*, Ov. *Met.* V 35-6 *inimica... pectora rupisset* (= XII 117), '**rumpere** *bei Ausdrücken des Tötens* (*tödlichen Treffens*)': Bömer there, with other examples. So St. may again allude to Melior's wish to die.

dilectos...oscula: 'You press with your lips the dear eyes and the cold lips'.

For M's *lambis* I write Peerlkamp's *labris*, approved only by Klotz 1896, 7 (but not in his edition). Firstly, *lambere* is nearly always contemptuous for human beings (*TLL* VII^2 899, 15 ff.). Secondly, when *dilectos premis visus* stands by itself, it means 'you close his eyes', which is a rite performed immediately after death: V 1, 196 *cara pressit sua lumina dextra*, Verg. *A.* IX 487 *pressi...oculos*, Ov. *Am.* III 9, 49 *madidos... pressit ocellos* and many examples in E.-F. 141 § 41I, *RE* III 347, 59 ff. (Mau), Toynbee 1971, 44. Closing the eyes at the funeral is (not surprisingly) nowhere mentioned. Another advantage of *labris* is that the metonymic use of *visus*, eyes, and *oscula*, lips (III 3, 177, *Th.* XII 319, 802, 45-6n.), are on one line; St. then characteristically employs two words for 'lips'.

Bentley's *libas*, accepted by Markland and Postg., stands open to most of the above objections. For more details: van Dam 386-7.

Kissing the deceased is a *topos* of the funeral: III 3, 19-20, 177, V 1, 200, see *Th.* XII 319, 802, Ov. *Am.* III 9, 53-4, *Ep.* 11, 117, *Epic. Drusi* 138, *cf.* Prop. II 13, 29 *osculaque in gelidis ponis...labellis*, Ov. *Met.* XI 738, a travesty of the motif in Luc. VI 564-5: E.-F. 145 § 45G, *cf.* F 'embracing the deceased'[36]. For examples from Greek tragedy (e.g. Eur. *Med.* 1399 f., *Hipp.* 1432, *Hik.* 1100), see Strehlein 64.

visus: 'Eyes', like IV 2, 30-1 *fessis...visibus, Th.* VI 277 *inocciduis... visibus*, IX 367, *al.* For *frigida*: 146-7n.

173-4. maesta: Of course *apo koinou*; but it seems to be no accident that the adjective is coupled with *mater*, not with *genitor*, since the grief-stricken Melior claims this role. In spite of their own grief the parents are *attoniti*, bewildered at Melior's grief. *Attoniti* is a good word here, for it often refers to someone 'stunned with sadness': V 1, 29, *Th.* IV 90, *al.*, *OLD* 2b.

175-8.: The grief expressed by the participants of the funeral, esp. Melior, is only natural, for the whole of Rome is mourning Glaucias. St. leads over to this *topos* by the formula *quid mirum* (157-82 above). Thereby he returns to the beginning of the funeral, and thus begins to lessen the grief, for the emphasis is on Glaucias' appearance before the cremation (178-82).

That the whole city is present at the funeral is often mentioned in consolatory poetry, see 19-21n. It is one instance of Sts.' juxtaposing 'one' and 'many', implying that all the world is concerned about the person he praises in his poetry: e.g. 159-62n., I 2, 231 ff., II 2, 64 ff., 74 ff., II 4, 16 ff., II 5, 27 ff., II 6, 86 ff., II 7, 31 ff., *cf.* also II 1, 218 ff. *omnes...ast hic...nos*, II 6, 34-5. Another example of these juxtapositions is that of 'great' and 'small': I 3, 50-1 and Fr. 39 n. 3, II 1, 124-5n., II 3, 62-3, II 4, 11 *at tibi quanta domus...augusti* (16), IV 4, 71-2, IV 6, 43 ff.

plebs...agmina: 'All the people and the crowds leading your way wailed the wicked event'. Thus, more or less, all translators. It could also be explained as 'all the people wailed the wicked event and the funeral train preceding them': for the hendiadys, see 19-20 *nefas et agmina*, for *plebs...flerunt*: e.g. *Th.* I 561 *plebs...litant* and Heuvel's note. But the first interpretation seems the least strained one: the crowds of Rome had turned out to watch the procession pass by (20), and many people (not of the *plebs*, one assumes) were preceding the bier.

agmen: For a funeral train occurs also at V 1, 216.

Flaminio...transvehit: 'Which the Mulvian bridge made cross (the Tiber) by the Flaminian way'. All funerals and cremations were pro-

[36] *Epic. Drusi* 95, quoted by Vollm. (as 93), is irrelevant, for it belongs to the *descriptio mortis*.

hibited within the city: Cic. *Leg.* II 58 *hominem mortuum in urbe ne sepelito neve urito* (= XII Tables), Toynbee 1971, 48. The grave was on the right bank of the Tiber, on the via Flaminia, *cf.* Mart. VI 28, 5 *iuncto Flaminiae iacet sepulchro.*

limite: Instead of *via* is not unusual and occurs often in St.: e.g. II 2, 11, IV 3, 85, 109, V 1, 186, *Th.* II 61 with Mulder's note, Cic. *Rep.* VI 26 *limes ad caeli aditum,* Verg. *A.* IX 323, Luc. II 412, VII 867 (Housman), Sen. *Thy.* 803, 841, Lunderstedt 67, *TLL* VII^2 1410, 40-5, 64-73.

In a few cases a proper name is added, but always, except here, in the gen.: II 2, 11, Liv. XXII 15, 11 *Appiae limite,* Flor. *Epit.* IV 8, 6 *interciso Herculanae viae limite*: *TLL loc. cit.* 8 ff.

Mulvius agger: At the *pons Mulvius,* now *ponte molle,* the *via Flaminia* crosses the Tiber.

M has *Molvius* (and σ *Milvius*), a form which lies at the base of Italian *molle.* This is printed by most editors. Traglia-Ar. have *Milvius* and Clouard the strange *Moevius* (translated as *Malvius*). *Mulvius,* however, printed only by Vollm. and Saenger, is the correct form; this is always given by good mss. and *Res Gestae* 20, 5. *Molvius* is late, and was probably introduced by the scribe of M, see *RE* XVI^1 516.

agger for 'bridge' is unparalleled. It can be used to designate a road, or the foundations of one (*TLL* I 1309, 21 ff.), sometimes in combination with *pons* (Tac. *Ann.* I 61, II 7). In one case a proper name is added to it: Rut. Nam. I 39 *Aurelius agger* = *via Aurelia.* Sidonius implies (*Ep.* I 5, 3) that it may have been a technical term for the road-surface of a bridge: *pervii pontes quos antiquitas a fundamentis ad usque aggerem calcabili silice crustatum crypticis arcubus fornicavit. TLL* mentioning our vs. adds '(*via et pons*)'.

Note how St. here heaps difficulties and solecisms. Even if we content ourselves with saying that St. 'merely' says 'The Mulvian mound made them cross the Tiber by the Flaminian track', the whole is very unusual.

transvehit: A personification, *cf.* II 2, 30 *erepit porticus,* III 2, 84-5 *an facili te praetermiserit unda...ora maris. Pons transvehit,* however, was perhaps not felt as a strong personification, *cf.* Liv. XXI 47 *Hispanos...inflati transvexerint utres,* Sil. IV 488 *pons...qui Dardanium transvexerat agmen.*

immeritus: 'Undeserving (of death)': *Th.* VII 23 *immeritos cineri dabit...urbes,* IV 6, 83, *OLD* 1a. For its other sense, 'undeserved', see V 2, 100. Glaucias did not deserve death: 223 *non...meruit...mori*; now that he is dead, he deserves laments: 178.

178-82. Formaque aevoque: Thus Ianus Guilelmus (*Quaestt. Plaut.*), and all editors after him for M's *ac voce.* For the combination, see 36-136n. For *-que...-que*: 220-2n.

talis...Ophelten: St. compares Glaucias to Palaemon and to Opheltes. Palaemon is Ino's son Melicertes, whose name was changed after his mother had jumped into the sea with him, see 143n. Opheltes is the small child of king Lycurgus and queen Eurydice of Nemea. He was killed by a serpent while his nurse Hypsipyle was absent: *Th.* V 505-VI 946.

The *tert. comp.* is both less and more than *formaque aevoque*: it is youth, for both mythical boys, like Glaucias, were young, Opheltes even hardly more than a baby, see *Th.* IV 787 ff. But it is not *forma*, for Palaemon as a *naufragus*, and Opheltes (*Th.* V 596 ff., 598 *totum...in vulnere corpus*) were not *integri et nullo temerati corpora damno* (vs. 156).

Secondly, both Opheltes and Palaemon were immortalized, and games in their honour were instituted: the Nemean games for Opheltes, the Isthmian games for Palaemon, *cf.* Fr. 102 n. 5, *RE* XVI 2323. Though Glaucias has not become immortal, St. describes his arrival in Elysium (183 ff.), and invokes him (*ades* 227), asking for his return in dreams. I think that, by the comparisons here, St. hyperbolically implies that Glaucias is as important as those deified children. For a similar comparison: III 1, 142 ff., where the grandson of Pollius Felix is favourably compared to Opheltes and Palaemon, and esp. II 6, 30-3n.

Thirdly, Opheltes and Palaemon are both, like Glaucias, firmly associated with foster-parents: The story of Ino is exceedingly complex (Fr. 60 n. 5, 62 n. 1, Bömer on Ov. *Met.* IV 416, *RE* XII 2297, XV 514). But two important points are that she is Bacchus' foster-mother (see 89-90) as well as the exemplary mother of Palaemon; they are the pre-eminent mother-and-child of antiquity: Verg. *A.* V 823, Ov. *Met.* IV 542 with Bömer's note, Fortgens on *Th.* VI 12. Ino, Bacchus and Palaemon are mentioned together at *Th.* I 11-4, X 425. As regards Opheltes, his nurse did wrong in leaving him, but this was ordained by Fate (*Th.* IV 781); anyway, the boy preferred her to his real mother: *Th.* VI 166 *illa* (= *altrix*) *tibi genetrix*, see 102-3 here.

Some other points are notable in these comparisons: they are very graphic, offering a vivid picture, as St. likes to do: Palaemon, wet from the sea, lying under his mother, Opheltes, first playing in the meadows of Lerna, then lying mutilated on the pyre. On this love of St. for the concrete picturesque detail, see, apart from 92-3n.: Legras 1905, 263 ff., Duncan *passim*, on Ino and Palaemon esp. 27-8, 44, 81 ff.[37]. These two are painted also vividly at *Th.* I 14, 122 *gremioque Palaemona pressit*, see VFl. VIII 21-2, IX 331.

[37] Duncan's interesting treatment is vitiated by two basic assumptions: that pictorial poetry is poetry inspired by existing pictures and that the tendency towards picture-drawing is absent from the *Silvae* (5-12).

Both Opheltes and Palaemon are associated with Thebes, and thus especially important for St. in connection with his Thebaid. The story of Opheltes, his death and cremation, is told at length in *Th.* V 505 ff., see also IV 787-97 (one of the most moving descriptions of a playing child in antiquity). For Ino, Palaemon and Thebes: III 2, 39 *Tu tamen ante omnes diva cum matre Palaemon/ annue, si vestras amor est mihi pandere Thebas.*

Parallelism in the comparisons: two verses each, 'similarly' (*talis, sic*) beginning each comparison, the names ending it, with an attribute in the third foot of the first and third verse (*prolatus, ludentem*).

Variation: *talis...sic*, see I 2, 242-4, II 6, 45-6, IV 2, 44-7, *Th.* IV 795-6, Verg. *A.* X 565-9 (*qualis...sic*), Ov. *Am.* I 7, 13-7. Palaemon and Opheltes are subject and object respectively, the place-names are expressed adjectivally (*Isthmiacos*) and as a noun (*Lernae*), *talis in* is followed by an accusative, *sic in* by an ablative.

in Isthmiacos prolatus...portus...naufragus: St. varies on the traditional legend, where Ino is deified and becomes a goddess of the sea, Leucothea, and Melicertes, having become Palaemon, is carried to the Isthmus by a dolphin: Paus. I 44, 8, II 1, 3 (or a ship: Lact. Plac. on *Th.* III 479).

Here both mother and son, apparently dead, have reached the Isthmus: *imposita sub matre Palaemon*; for the ending *cf.* III 2, 39 above = *Ciris* 396 = Claud. *Carm.* 8, 465. There seems little ground for assuming that St. here alludes to any of the known variants of the legend: *prolatus* is very vague: 'to carry or move from one place to another' (*OLD* 1a). St. uses it of the river Alpheius emerged from the sea: I 2, 206 and for the sun rising from the Ocean *Ach.* II 2. *Naufragus* could point to the ship rather than to the dolphin, but Lactantius only says *navigio delatus*, without mentioning a shipwreck. St. probably employs *naufragus* in a loose sense, 'arrived by the water', see *Th.* IX 310 *volvitur in fluctus* (of the river), *heu cuius naufragus undae.* Vollm. hesitates between dolphin or unknown version, Fr. 62 n. 1 thinks the dolphin is meant. See also II 6, 30-3n.

The conjectures proferred for *prolatus* do not clarify what St. means: *ploratus* (Domitius), *delatus* (ed. Parmensis), approved by Markl., *proiectus* (Baehrens), *prolutus* (Polster 1879, 17), *perlatus* (Saenger). For *Isthmiacos portus* Otto (1887, 532) wrote *-o -u*[38].

portus: For the poetic plural see also I 2, 203, I 3, 69, II 2, 140, *Th.* V 350, *al.*, since Verg. *G.* IV 390, more frequently in Aeneid and Ov.: Schink 103-4.

sic et: For the postposition of *et*, see II 2, 81-2n.

---

[38] None of these conjectures can be found in the four most recent editions (only Sb., after Phill., has *prolutus*); the first 3 are not mentioned in any *app. crit.*

anguiferae...Lernae: The word *anguifer*[39] occurs since Prop. II 2, 8. But St. is the first to adopt it not for someone wearing snakes (Medusa, Cerberus), but for a region or the like, *cf.* III 2, 119 *anguiferam...domum.*

Adjectives in *-fer* are popular in Latin poetry, both for their metrical usefulness and their ornamental quality. St. has 40 of them, e.g. *aestifer* III 3, 91, *vitifer* IV 2, 36. He innovated 6 adjectives of this kind, see Schubert 41 ff., Schamberger 285-7, Mulder on *Th.* II 400, Arens, 94-5n.

Lernae is synecdoche for *Nemeae,* where Opheltes was killed; thus also V 3, 142 *gramine Lernae* for the Nemean games, *cf.* Fortgens on *Th.* VI 131, Fr. 62 n. 3, and Markland in his *Addenda.* St. sometimes employs Lerna for the whole Argolid, as when he says *Lernaeus* for Argive or Greek (*Th.* III 348, VIII 562, *al.*: *Lerna*; *Th.* I 38, III 461, *al.*: *Lernaeus*), see Lunderstedt 38.

Similarly Verg. (*A.* I 650) writes *Argiva Helena* for 'Spartan': Servius says '*a vicinitate dixit Argivae...cum Spartana fuerit*'; *Sidonia Dido* (*A.* I 446, 613, XI 74) for Tyrian Dido. *Larisaeus Achilles*: *A.* II 197, XI 404 for Achilles from Phtia, see van Wees 75-6, 133-4.

For other possible innovations in this field by St., like *Marathonius* for *Atticus* (*Th.* XII 196), see Lunderstedt 38 ff. (without *Lerna* for *Nemea,* however), II 7, 70-2n.

St. can use this *synecdoche* because Lerna and Nemea are near to each other, but also, I think, because both suggest snakes (the Lernan Hydra), see *Th.* V 579 *cognatae stagna...Lernae* about the snake which killed Opheltes.

bibit ignis: For *ignis* M has *anguis,* printed by Kl., Clouard, Fr., Mar., Sb., Traglia and Traglia-Ar. *Ignis* is a conjecture of Köstlin (1877, 177), accepted by the other edd. and defended by Håk. 51-2.

Anguis is wrong for three reasons: **1)** The snake killed Opheltes unknowingly: *Th.* V 538-9 *occidis extremo destrictus verbere caudae ignaro serpente,* see Vessey 1973, 188. So it did not bite the boy, or suck his blood (as Clouard, Fr. and Traglia-Ar. translate). Mar. objects (*Add.* p. 144, his only mention of *ignis,* without even mentioning Köstlin) that the snake was thirsty, see *Th.* V 518-28, esp. 524 *incensus siti.* But it is nowhere said that it slakes this thirst with Opheltes' blood; on the contrary, the thirst explains the snake not noticing the little boy. **2)** *Bibit* can hardly mean 'sucked his blood', only 'swallowed him' (*OLD* 8), which is not true, see Håk. 52. Still less does *rescissum squamis* (= *destrictus verbere caudae* in the Thebaid) mean 'bitten by a snake' (thus Merrill 89). *Bibit ignis* is also difficult; but *haurit ignis* is frequent (*OLD* 7a), and *cf.* Ov.

---

[39] Not *anguiferus,* as the Concordance has it.

Met. IX 173 *sorbent avidae praecordia flammae*, and *Th.* X 674-5 *cupressus combibit flammas*. **3)** *Anguis* severes the connection with the cremation, while *avidus ignis* points back to *ignis invidus* (164-5), see *avidus* for Charon's barge in 186. One of the obvious parallels between Opheltes and Glaucias is a costly funeral, see esp. *Th.* VI 206-12.

Anguis must have arisen out of *anguiferae* (thus already Markland); for the interchange *anguis*/ *ignis* see Håk. n. 68.

183-234. CONSOLATIO: Practically all *epicedia* end with the *consolatio* proper; only III 3 and Ov. *Am.* III 9 have an independent ending following the *consolatio*: E.-F. 113. In this part the tension between grief and comfort is finally resolved, after consolatory topics have already been mentioned earlier in the poem, see *Intr.*, Newmyer 71-2.

This is not to say that the *consolatio* is always a long section; here, in II 5 and II 7 (not the most clear examples of an *epicedion*) it is longest: 22 % of this poem, 23% of II 5 (24-30) and 22 % of II 7 (107-35), *cf.* II 4, 33-7 (or rather funeral), II 6, 93-105, III 3, 205-12, V 1, 177-93 and 247-62, V 3, 250-61 and 277-94.

The *consolatio* in II 1 has also the widest range of consolatory topics. I distinguish three aspects: **1)** The deceased enters Elysium and meets his friends or famous people: 183-207. **2)** General human/ philosophic reasons not to mourn anymore: 208-226. **3)** The (prayed for) appearance of the dead one in dreams and the like: 226-34. The mythological component, *viz.* the reception into Elysium, has generally far more preponderance in St. than here: II 6, 98-103, II 7, 107-35, III 3, 205-7, V 1, 192-3 and 249-62, V 3, 277-94. Arguments for giving up mourning like 209 ff. are rare elsewhere in St.

E.-F. (124-5) distinguishes two kinds of *consolatio*: in the first the poet keeps sharing the grief of the survivor and quasi-spontaneously offers the arguments for comfort, introduced by an adversative particle: II 4, 33, II 5, 24, III 3, 195, Hor. *Carm.* I 24, 19, Prop. IV 11, 61, Ov. *Am.* II 6, 49, III 9, 59, *Eleg. Maec.* 147 ff. In the second case the poet somewhat unexpectedly turns around to criticize the survivor for his grief: here in 208, II 6, 93 ff. (n.), V 1, 247 ff., *Epic. Drusi* 317 ff., *cf.* Sen. *Ep.* 99, 2 *solacia expectas? convicia accipe*, Kassel 3 ff. For this group the question is an important structural device—though not, I would say, in this poem.

We must not forget, though, that for St. the main comfort is found in the entrance into Elysium. The outright criticism of the survivor, together with the argumentative tone, an influence of the prose-consolations according to E.-F., is merely an adjunct to this.

183-207. Elysium: St. treats Glaucias' descent into the Underworld (183-8) and his reception there (191-207). The descent is not so much described as alluded to, by the reassurance that Glaucias will not be harmed by the powers of darkness. St. makes more use of this topic than others: here, V 1, 249-52, V 3, 277-83; outside the *consolatio* proper: III 3, 26-8, V 1, 192-3, see *CE* 1109, 19 ff. *non ego Tartareas penetrabo tristis ad undas...nec te terribilem fronte timebo Charon.* As a wish in Mart. V 34, 3-4 *Parvula ne nigras horrescat Erotion umbras/ oraque Tartarei prodigiosa canis.* Its counterpart is Prop. IV 5, 3-4 *Cerberus...terreat ossa sono.* The topic occurs also in other connections: Verg. *G.* IV 481-3, Hor. *Carm.* II 13, 33-6, II 20, 29, III 11, 15 ff. See Ettig 383, E.-F. 147 § 51, Vérilhac no. 25, *cf.* 181, 183, 185, 190, 201, II § 124.

Belief in an afterlife is immeasurably old, and so is the description of the descent into the Underworld: in classical literature since Homer *Od.* XI. For Rome, Alexandrian poetry is of vital importance: the first Roman instances of such a descent are Liv. Andr. (*Odusia*) and Enn. (esp. *Epicharmus*). By far the most influential description of the Underworld is, of course, the 6th book of the Aeneid: see Ettig *passim*, esp. 315, 343, Toynbee 1971, 35 and n. 77.

That the deceased will meet his friends or equals in Elysium is the most widespread argument in poetic *consolationes.* In St.: II 6, 98-102, II 7, 111-6, III 3, 206-7, V 1, 253-8, V 3, 284-7, outside the *consolatio* in III 3, 22-6. Other poets: Ov. *Am.* II 6, 57 (parody: birds), III 9, 61-6, *Epic. Drusi* 329-40, *cf. Eleg. Maec.* 178. In Greek verse-inscriptions: Vérilhac nos. 178, 180, II § 67, § 113. In other kinds of poetry: Tib. I 3, 57-8, Prop. III 18, 31-4, *al.* The idea of a happy afterlife in Elysium is rare in the *carmina epigraphica* and descriptions of an enchanting Elysium (202-5n. below) still more so. See Pikhaus 132 n. 39, 207-14, with notes 524, 525, 546, 548, 654. She concludes that the idea of Elysium did not really penetrate to the lower classes, see 242-4. In terms of reward for a good life Elysium plays virtually no role in the pagan *carmina.* A special category, favourite in Hellenistic poetry, is the meeting of former lovers: *A.* VI 442, Ov. *Met.* XI 61 ff., Prop. I 19, 11, see Norden on *A.* VI pp. 248-9, 343. For the whole, with more examples, also Greek ones, see E.-F. 147-8 § 52.

St., however, has given an original turn to this *topos* by two devices: he pretends that Mercury at the moment of Sts.' composing tells him that Glaucias is received into Elysium: 189-90n. And he makes Glaucias meet one of Melior's most intimate friends, Blaesus, instead of famous heroes (II 7, 111 ff., V 1, 253 ff.), poets (V 3, 284 ff.), family (II 6, 99, III 3, 206-7) or mythological figures (II 6, 101 ff.). This personal touch, unique in St., is matched by the vivid description of the encounter between

Glaucias and Blaesus (194 ff.), culminating in a celebration of their love for each other and for Melior.

183. Pone metus: *Th.* III 713, IX 895, XI 727, Ov. *Am.* III 6, 62, *Met.* I 736, III 634, *al.* For *ponere*: 48-9n.

The poetic plur. *metus* (φοβοί in Soph.) occurs since Verg. *A.* I 463 *solve metus*: Bednara 562.

Of Ausonius' poems on dead people some are akin to *Silv.* II 1: the series of poems on his little German slave-girl Bissula, the *Epicedion* on his little son (*Parent.* 10), and esp. his *De Glaucia immatura morte praevento* (*Epigr.* 42): *Laeta bis octono tibi iam sub consule pubes* (*cf. Silv.* IV 1, 1)/ *cingebat teneras, Glaucia adulte, genas/.../ cum properata dies* (*cf.* vs. 1 here; 54-5) *abstulit omne decus* (36-136n.)./ *Sed neque functorum* (209n.) *socius miscebere vulgo/ nec metues* (183) *Stygios flebilis umbra lacus.* See also II 6, 30-3n.

Pone...vereri: see the similar injunction in 208-9. Together they enclose this section. In a sense this reappears in 226 *nil flecteris istis*, the three injunctions (*pone, sedas, flectere* 227) punctuating the *consolatio*, which can be regarded as a final *persuasio*. In II 6, 93 ff. the sequence is reversed: 94-5 *quid...vulnus ames* (= 208) and 103 *pone, precor, questus* enclose the *consolatio*, which ends with reception into Elysium.

184-8. Cerberus...soror...navita: Cerberus, the Furies and Charon are the best-known terrors of a descent into the Underworld, see e.g. for Cerberus Norden on Verg. *A.* VI 384-416 (400-1 *licet...ianitor...latrans... terreat umbras*, the same motif: Plut. *non posse* 27, 1105A), *RE* XI[1] 271 ff., Roscher *Lex.* III 1119, Smith on Tib. I 3, 71. For the Furies: Norden on 374 f., Smith *loc. cit.* 69-70, *RE* VII 309-10, *RE Suppl.* VIII 124. For Charon: Norden on 295-305, Austin on 298 ff. (with literature), Roscher *Lex.* I 885-6, *RE* III 2177-8.

These three form what Cancik calls (1965, 31-2 with note 21) a *Mythologemtriade mit wachsenden Gliedern.* He states that, in the *Silvae, Mythologeme* often consist of three items, of which the last one is the longest, and gives examples. Notwithstanding, this is the only instance of a triad of mythological items in II 1, perhaps together with 111-3 and 215-7. The other mythological triads in *Silv.* II (when we take 'mythological' a bit broadly) are: II 2, 1-5, 19-20, 60-1, 109-11, 121-2, II 3, 6-7, II 6, 41-7, 54-7. Of those II 1, 184 ff., II 2, 1 ff., 109 ff., 121 ff., II 3, 6 ff., II 6, 54 ff. have *wachsende Glieder.* There exists, I think, also an other tendency in St., *viz.* to construct mythological *exempla* in pairs: II 1, 10-1, 88 ff., (perhaps) 112-3, 140 ff., 229-30, II 2, 34-5, 116-7, II 3, 51, II 6, 25 ff., 101-3.

terno latrabit ore: I 3, 5 *Illum nec calido latravit Sirius astro.*

ternus and *trinus* both occur twice in St.: IV 9, 15 *ternus*, V 3, 253 and *Th.* V 509 *trinus*. For their arbitrary use: *LHSz.* I 494 and for the sing. (contrast Sen. *Her.F.* 783-4 *Stygius canis...terna...capita concutiens*): Neue-W. II 331-5. *Cf.* Sil. I 279 (Geryon) *terna cervice* and 10-2n.

185. soror: St. employs *soror* to designate the Parcae (II 3, 75, III 3, 21 and often), the Muses (I 2, 10, *Th.* VII 628, *al.*) and the Furies (*Th.* V 66, 201, VIII 68, X 833, XI 415, XII 647[40]). *Cf.* Ov. *Met.* VI 662, Lunderstedt 63, 65. The Furies are generally distinguished by an attribute like *Stygius* (not in *Th.* V 201, XII 647); here the sense is made clear by *flammis* and *hydris*, see *anguicomae...sorores Th.* XII 647, *vipereas...-es* Ov. *Met.* VI 662.

Torches and snakes are common attributes of the Furies: torches II 7, 118-9 (n.), *Th.* IV 133, Enn. *scen.* 24-7 (Joc.), Verg. *A.* VI 605-7, Roscher *Lex.* I 1313, *RE* VII 309-10. Snakes are very often mentioned ('the detail is rarely forgotten by the Roman poets': Smith on Tib. I 3, 69-70), apparently since Aesch. (Paus. I 28, 6), e.g. *Th.* I 90, IV 485, XI 6 (with Venini), Verg. *A.* VI 28, Hor. *Carm.* II 13, 33, see Smith *loc. cit.*, Bömer on Ov. *Met.* IV 662, Vollm. on V 1, 28, *RE Suppl.* VIII 524.

Tib. is the first one to state explicitly that the Furies have snakes *instead* of hair (I 3, 69), followed by Lucan (IX 670 ff.). St. suggests the same thing here by *assurgentibus* (see *Th.* IV 580 *assurgit canities*, 124-5n.), and it is a conceit which he likes: also at *Th.* I 91, 115-6, V 3, 28 (music *Eumenidum audita comis* (!)), 278, *cf.* Mart. VII 1, 2, Claud. *Ruf.* I 42, *Eutr.* II 111, *Pros.* II 345.

186. avidae trux navita cumbae: Charon: V 1, 251-2 *navita...hospite cumba*, Verg. *A.* VI 315 *navita...tristis*, Sil. V 267 *navita cymba*/. Also *portitor* 229 and often in poets, e.g. *Th.* IV 479, XII 559, Verg. *A.* VI 298, *cf.* Carter *s.v.* Charon. *Vector...alga*: V 3, 283.

cumba is 'virtually a t.t. for Charon's boat': Austin on *A.* VI 303, e.g. Hor. *Carm.* II 3, 28, Juv. 2, 151, see *TLL* IV 1588, Norden on *A.* VI 413 f.

avidus is frequent for greedy death: *Th.* XI 410-1 *avidus regnator* (Dis), Prop. IV 6, 34, Sen. *Tro.* 400, Sil. XIV 622, *OLD* 3a.

187-8. interius subibit: 'He will draw to the shore farther inland', *viz.* nearer to the coast. In *AP* VII 365 (1st cent. B.C. = Vérilhac no. 187) Charon helps with a mounting ladder.

For *subibit*: 153-7n.

steriles ripas et adusta...litora: St. more than once characterizes the Underworld as a place where living things are sterile: *Th.* II 12 *steriles*

[40] Only VIII 68 and XII 647 are in the Concordance.

luci, III 3, 24 *pallentes lucos*, in a remarkable way in 204 (n.). This is illustrated by Sen. *Her.F.* 697 ff. *Non prata viridi laeta facie germinant/ nec adulta leni fluctuat Zephyri seges;/ nec ulla ramos silva pomiferos habet:/ sterilis profundi vastitas squalet soli/ et foeda tellus torpet aeterno situ.* This is connected with the tradition that the Underworld is a world of mere appearances, see 202-5n.

adusta litora = Phlegethon: *rapidus flammis...torrentibus amnis, Tartareus Phlegethon* (Verg. *A.* VI 550-1), *flumina igne flagrantia*: Sen. *Dial.* VI 19, 4, *fumantia...aequora*: Claud. *Rapt.* I 23-4, *cf.* Luc. III 16 *Acherontis adusti.* It is named Puriphlegethon in Homer (*Od.* X 513), see also *Th.* IV 55, 523, VIII 30.

adusta translates φλέγω. St. likes these etymological puns (162-5n.), especially when he alludes to or translates Greek, see II 2, 36-42n.

Both *litora* and *ripas* are strictly speaking poetic plurals: *litora* already since Enn. *Ann.* 389 and very often, see Schink 74-8, Bednara 558. *Ripas* (also II 7, 98) since Verg. *A.* VI 306, *cf.* 314. Without metrical compulsion e.g. Verg. *A.* VI 712, Ov. *Ep.* 9, 139, *Fast.* III 651: Schink 112.

188. ascendisse: All translators and *OLD* (4a) interpret <*navem*>: 'to embark'. This seems the most natural sense and it has parallels in V 1, 252 *locat hospite cumba* and V 3, 283 *in media componat alga.* This use of *ascendere* occurs since Pl. Absolute: Ov. *Ep.* 18, 11 *navita movit iter: ascensurus eram*, Plin. *Ep.* VI 16, 9 *deducit quadriremes, ascendit ipse.*

Vollm., on the other hand, explains as *ascendisse* <*ripam*>, quoting Cic. *Div.* I 58 *adversam ascendisse ripam. TLL* II 754, 35-6 adds Caes. *Gal.* I 27, 5 *transire...flumen, ascendere...ripas.* If this is right, St. is emulating Verg. *A.* VI 415-6 *vatemque virumque/ informi limo glaucaque exponit in ulva* (not quoted by Vollm.): Glaucias will not have to wade through the mud. It seems also probable that bringing the boat up to the other shore is a special service, while bringing it up to the shore for embarkation seems more natural. The chief objection is that the absolute use of *ascendere* is strange.

For the perfect tense: 82-6n.

dura facultas: *Oxymoron. Facultas* is perhaps not more than 'possibility, opportunity' (*TLL* VI 145, 37 ff., 148, 26), but a negative adj. with it is not found elsewhere, unless it means 'faculty of the mind': *TLL ibid.* 156, 44 ff.

Facultas is very rare in poetry: not in Catul., Tib., Prop., Sil., once in Verg. and Ov., twice in Lucr., VFl., Sen. trag., 3 times in Luc. St. has it 9 times, 6 of which are in the Thebaid, showing that he did not think the word vulgar or unpoetic.

For the rhythm, *cf.* 228.

189-90. Quid...nuntiat: St. tells a cheering (*gaudenti*) message (*nuntiat*) brought by Mercury: this message is the content of 190-207. St. gives a very interesting turn to his poem and the well-known *topos* of reunion in Elysium by his use of the present tense *nuntiat*. This indicates that St. wants to suggest that what he tells is happening at the same moment; the fictional time and real time coincide. The present tense is maintained up to 207, apart from two verbs following *ubi* (*agnovit* 196, *sensit* 201).

Vollm. suggests that St. has had a vision of Mercury and Fr. (62 n. 5) improbably states that St. has seen him in a dream. But it is not the theme of epiphany that matters. This is a frequent topic in Hellenistic poetry, see Nisbet-H. *Intr.* on Hor. *Carm.* II 19. Horace's poem, however, tells of a past vision of Bacchus. St. here employs a structural device to involve the reader/hearer in the situation of the poem. Among other things, the introduction of Mercury telling how Glaucias is doing in the Underworld serves to blend the boundaries between the real and the mythological world (88-102n.). More generally the reality of the poem is heightened by *quid nuntiat*, as opposed to the content of the message.

St. has some similar examples. In III 3, 205 ff. *talia dicentem genitor...audit et...descendit..(et) fert* it is suggested that the dead Etruscus is listening to his son. In III 2, St. prays for a safe journey for Maecius Celer; after finishing this prayer he says *Audimur...Ecce...iamque* (50 ff.). Likewise in V 2 St. alludes to a military command which Vettius Bolanus will certainly get in the future. Then suddenly this 'speculation' comes true at the moment of composing: *sed quis...intrat nuntius?...En...Caesar...Ausonius committit munia ferri* (168 ff., *cf.* Newmyer 119-20). See also II 3, 62-3n., II 4, 22-3n.

proles Cyllenia: Mercury, who was born on Mt. Cyllene in Arcadia. In Latin he is first designated as Cyllenius by Verg. *G.* I 337 (the planet), *A.* IV 252, *al.* (the god). Also at *Th.* II 89, VII 34, VFl. I 436: *proles Cyllenia. Cyllenia proles: Th.* I 293, VII 74, Verg. *A.* IV 258, Ov. *Ars* III 725, Petr. 124 vs. 269, Sil. XIII 630, see Carter 69, Pease on *A.* IV *locc. citt.*, Heuvel on *Th.* I 293. St. never calls him *Mercurius*, but always employs a periphrase, like *Maia satus, Arcadius, Atlantiades*: Mulder on *Th.* II 1.

Here he is the *psychopompus* (since Hom. *Od.* XXIV 1) and the messenger of the gods, see Nisbet-H. on Hor. *Carm.* II 10, 19 *superis deorum gratum et imis.* He is regularly equipped with a staff (*virga*: m; *virgo*: M) *qua...nigra subire Tartara...adsueverat umbras* (*Th.* I 306-8). On the meaning of his different kinds of wand: Nisbet-H. on Hor. *Carm.* I 10, 18 (with lit.), Mulder on *Th.* II 11, Pease on *A.* IV 242, *Kleine Pauly* 2, 1071-2 (lit.). This staff is *gaudens* because Mercury himself is happy to

bring his joyous message. Together with *laetus* it tries to create the mood of relaxation necessary in the *consolatio.*

191-3. Blaesi: Glaucias encounters Melior's friend Blaesus in the Underworld. On this kind of reunion: 183-207n. Heuvel (322) suggests that the idea to let Glaucias meet Blaesus was inspired by Mart. V 24, 7-8 *Inter tam veteres ludat lasciva patronos/ et nomen blaeso garriat ore meum* (a dead slave-girl).

Blaesus is only known from St. (here and in II 3, 76-7) and Mart. VIII 38, see *PIR* I 366. He is always mentioned in connection with Melior. He must have been of high birth: *generosus,* (*cf.* V 2, 22 *titulis generosus avitis,* V 3, 146). Maybe he was a man of letters, maybe only a *connoisseur,* like Melior himself (II *Praef.* 1-5n., *Intr.* II 1), for Melior founded a fund to enable the *collegium scribarum* to celebrate Blaesus' birthday (II 3 *loc. cit.*, Mart. *loc. cit.* 10-4, Fr. 62 n. 6, 75 n. 2, see *RE* VII 1144, II 7 *Intr.*). He must have been dead for a long time, probably over 12 years, for 12 year old Glaucias knows him from the portrait in Melior's house (191-3, *dum* 'because'), apparently not from life. Blaesus does not know Glaucias: 198-9 (see 201). He was married and had children (*nepotum* 199), unlike Melior. In II 1 the reciprocal affection of the two men is stressed: 192-3, 201. In II 3 it is rather Melior's *pietas* towards him (192 here, towards Glaucias throughout this poem) which is emphasized, see *Intr.* under **III**.

Apart from the topic 'the deceased will meet friends in Elysium', St. now and then introduces friends of the dedicatee: II 3, 77, IV 4, 20, IV 6, 94, V 2, 152. These are rather abrupt introductions. St. has made a *topos* of those friends, but handles it according to the demands of each poem.

effigies...ora...similes...ceras: A portrait of Blaesus in encaustic painting. This is a technique where mixed wax and paint are burnt into the background of a painting, though the exact method is not clear, *cf.* Plin. *Nat.* XXXV 122-3 where it is described (with Seller's note on 149), Vollm. on I 1, 101, *RE* V 2570-8, literature in *Artemis Lexikon* under *Enkaustik.* St. gives a short description of it in a comparison *Ach.* I 332-3 *artifici victurae pollice cerae/ accipiunt formas ignemque manumque sequuntur.* The metonymy *cera(e)* is not unusual: also at II 2, 63, III 1, 95, III 3, 201 (dead Etruscus) *te similem doctae referet mihi linea cerae,* IV 6, 21, since Var. *R.* III 17, 4, see *TLL* III 850, 64 ff., Lunderstedt 68. For the poetic plural, frequent both for writing-tablets and effigies: Bednara 136-7, Schink 39. The poetic plur. of *effigies* apparently only here, *Ciris* 491, Sil. XV 181, *Th.* IX 582.

It was customary to have portraits of dead loved ones in the house: III 3, 201 above, V 1, 1-6, Ov. *Rem.* 723-4 *ceras remove! quid imagine muta/ carperis*, Tac. *Ag.* 46, 3 *non intercedendum putem imaginibus quae marmore aut aere finguntur*, Plin. *Ep.* II 1, 12, *CE* 480, 4 ff. *marmoreos vultus statuit oculos animumque/ longius ut kara posset saturare figura*, Vérilhac no. 84, 5 (2nd/1st cent. B.C.): (my father) μορφὰν θῆκε τυπωσαμέναν. See also II 7, 128-31n.

For *ceras* M reads *curas*. The first to emend to *ceras* (see V 1, 1 *similes...ceras*, where M has *caeras*), and explain *tergentem pectore ceras* as 'pressing the effigy against his breast' (below) was Polster (1884, 4-5), see van Dam 387. The mistake was caused by *pectore*: *pectore curae* is very common: 71, IV 6, 89 *-a -ae*, V 1, 77 *-e -is*, V 2, 71 *-e -ae*.

ardua...ora: *Ardua* because important people are always represented as tall. This goes for gods, heroes and emperors; in that case religious significance preponderates over the aesthetic, *cf.* Cancik 1965, 89 ff., esp. 92-3 with notes and literature, I 1 *passim*, III 2, 85, Ov. *Met.* III 181 and Bömer, Austin on Verg. *A.* II 773. But it is also used of more modest mortals, whether dead or not: I 2, 114-5, II 1, 202 *magna cervice*, II 7, 91 *ardua*, IV 4, 9 (*Marcellum*) *celso praesignem vertice nosces* (see *ibid* 67), *cf.* IV 2, 25, *CE* 1109, 11-2 *sed verus iuveni color et sonus et status ipse/ maior erat nota corporis effigie.*

serta ligantem: V 3, 56-7 *frondentia...praemia...tibi...ligarem.* Skutsch' *litantem* (1893, 829) is unnecessary.

videt et: 48-9n.

tergentem pectore: No satisfying parallel for *tergere* 'to press' has been found. Polster (above) quotes V 1, 163-4 *pectore terget limina*, but there violent grief is described. Vollm. gives some vss. where deep distress is manifested by beating head or breast against a wall, floor, rocks *etc.*, but these are irrelevant.

tergere occurs 8 times in St. (apart of II *Praef.* 3 *tersissime*), but nowhere does it mean 'to press'. *Saucia tersi pectora* (V 5, 44-5) is quite different. An alternative, however, is difficult to find; for another strange use, see Hor. *S.* II 2, 24 *gallinā tergere palatum*: to eat a chicken. See also van Dam 387-8.

194-207.: The encounter goes in three stages: **1)** Glaucias recognizes Blaesus from his portrait and tries to draw his attention (194-8). **2)** Blaesus notices the boy and thinks he is one of his own unknown descendants (198-9). **3)** It becomes clear that Glaucias was the beloved boy of Melior; Blaesus shows him Elysium and they mingle in their love (200-7).

In **1)** the contrast between the two is vividly drawn: Blaesus amidst the great Romans: *Ausonios, Quirini, proceres* (IV 2, 32 *Romuleos proceres*, V 3,

176 *Romuleam stirpem proceresque futuros*, 203 *Latii proceres*. For the theme, see 183-207n., Norden and Austin on Verg. *A*. VI 752 ff.). And the timid boy: *timide, tacito, summos*. **3)** is the climax. Note that as soon as Blaesus knows that Glaucias is not of his own flesh and blood, but an adopted child of his friend, he becomes very friendly to him: *non spernit* becomes *gaudens* (198-9/ 203). Blaesus in a sense takes over Melior's role, see 202-5n., which culminates in the intense and intricate triangle of 207-8 (n.).

194-8. Lethaei...gurgitis: A grand periphrase, *cf.* III 5, 38 *Lethaeos...amnis, Th.* XII 559 *-amnis*, III 28 = XI 82-3 *-a ripa*, III 3, 22, Verg. *A*. VI 714 *-um flumen*, Catul. 65, 5 *-o gurgite*.

For the theme of the shades wandering on the banks of Lethe, see III 3, 22, V 3, 24-7, *cf.* II 6, 100, II 7, 101, for the souls waiting to be born: *A*. VI 714 ff.

series: Concrete here, 'progeny'. We are seldom forced to explain *series* thus; not elsewhere in St. See Luc. VIII 696 *Ptolemaeorum manes seriemque pudendam*, twice in Claud.: *Eutr.* I 457-8 *gens Claudia surgat et Curii series, Laus Seren.* 56 *series...Aelia*, 'the family of Hadrian'. In *Eutr.* I there is a *varia lectio 'veteres'*, which Birt prefers, stating *'series Curii pro Curiorum dici non quit'*. But *seriem Quirini* and *Curii series* support each other.

vestigia iungit: 'Walks beside him': Prop. III 9, 33 *Caesaris...famae vestigia iuncta tenetis*, VFl. III 8-9 *Aesonidae iunctos...gressus Cyzicus*, VII 374, Sil. IV 372, Claud. *Rapt. Pros.* II 10 *comites gressum iunxere sorores, cf.* Liv. XLIV 26, 3 (*peditum*) *iungentium cursum equis*, Mart. III 91, 2 *iungit iter, TLL* VII² 658, 37-40[41].

summosque lacessit amictus: The detail of the child asking for attention by pulling at someone's garment comes from Homer: *Il.* XVI 9, XXII 493 (Astyanax) ἄλλον μὲν χλαίνης ἐρύων ἄλλον δὲ χιτῶνος. In Ap. Rhod. III 146-8 it means 'to entreat'.

lacessit, 'to pluck', really 'excite'. *Lacessere* occurs with a thing, a human attribute, as an object: *TLL* VII² 832, 67 ff. But a thing as concrete as a garment is not found elsewhere, only Sil. X 137 *nostra tegmina*, where shooting and throwing in a battle is described. *Cf.* also Ov. *Tr.* V 9, 30 *fores fronte lacessit equus* 'bangs against'. Here it is not at all forceful: it is taken up by *trahentem* (198).

summos amictus, 'the hem of his cloak'. *Summus* sometimes means 'the extremity of', but then mostly as 'the top', *summus mons* and the like, note Pl. *Men.* 167 *summum...vestimentum muliebre*: the upper side. Or it is 'the surface' as in *summa unda* (Verg. *A*. VI 357, *al.*, see II 7, 26).

---

[41] Here Sil. IV is omitted and *Silv.* II 1 misprinted as 1, 2.

There is no reason why 'extremity' could not mean 'hem', but there are no good parallels: nearest come *summa oscula*, 'the tip of the lips' (Verg. *A.* XII 434), *summo animo...inhaerere* (Sen. *Dial.* III 19, 5) and esp. Hor. *Ep.* I 1, 54-5 *Ianus summus ab imo* 'from one side of the Forum to the other'. The neuter plur. as a noun, moreover, is once or twice used in a similar meaning: Sen. *Dial.* IV 3, 3 *oratori...dum ad dicendum componitur summa riguerunt*, 'his extremities', Vulg. *Matth.* 24: 31 *a summis caelorum*: see Forc. IV 613 col. 2-3 and 614 col. 2.

inde magis sequitur: 'Then he follows more audaciously', because (*enim*) Blaesus does not ignore him anymore. *Inde* takes up *primum* (196). For *magis* = *confidentius* or the like, see Hand under *magis* n° 4, *cf.* Quint. *Inst.* IV 1, 18 *res...tractanda...etiam ei magis in quam videatur propensior.* Some conjectures have been made by those not aware of this use, among others *morans* (Saenger) and *audens* (Courtney 1968, 54).

198-9. neque enim magis ille trahentem spernit: Vollm. states: '*Die beiden* **magis** *entsprechen einander* (*man denke einmal statt des* **neque enim magis** *ein* **quo minus**'), quoting Catul. 64, 274 *vento crescente magis, magis increbescunt.* This is not very clear. Supposedly he explains as *eo magis Glaucias sequitur quo magis Blaesus eum non spernit.* That can not be right, both because *magis...non* is not *quo minus*, and because it leaves out *enim.* Fr. in his *app. crit.* follows Vollm., though he translates also '*malgré l'insistance de la main qui le tire*' (Clouard and Traglia-Ar. skip *magis*).

The second *magis* must be taken with *trahentem*: 'as he more boldly plucked' (Mozl.), and in this sense *magis* and *magis* answer each other. Glaucias follows Blaesus more courageously and pulls more insistently at his hem, since Blaesus does not push him back. Markl. judged *trahentem* a proof of *intoleranda rusticitas* and wrote *sequentis.*

et: *neque spernit et...credit* are on one line; Blaesus' real enthusiasm begins only when he learns that Glaucias is something better than a descendant. Therefore Havet's *at* (109) is exactly wrong. Contrast Marcia's father, Sen. *Dial.* VI 25, 2, (in heaven) *nepotem suum...applicabat sibi* (*cf.* 202) *...et...siderum meatus docet...ut...ignotarum urbium monstrator* (203-5) *...Et in profunda terrarum permittere aciem iubet* (206), see II 7, 107-11n.

200-1. delicias...pignus...puerum: Three words summing up the relationship between Melior and Glaucias in ambiguous terms in one sentence, see *Intr.*, 82-6n.

rarus: 'Of uncommon quality' (*OLD* 6), unique: *rarissima uxorum* II *Praef.* 25, *cf.* V 1, 11, IV 8, 32 *iuvenum rarissime.*

sensit: 'Had become aware', presumably by addressing him.

amissi...solacia Blaesi: A *double entendre*: Melior, as it now appears, had taken care of Glaucias (at least partly) to forget his grief for the death

of Blaesus; or, less probably, it may imply that Glaucias, already in Melior's charge, gave him comfort at the time. In the first case, Blaesus had died before Glaucias' birth, in the second case, when he was very small. Besides 'a comfort for the death of B.' the phrase also means 'a comfort to the dead B.'. Blaesus takes over Melior's task regarding Glaucias: 194-207n., 202-5n. This results in the fusion of all three in love for each other expressed in 207.

solacia[42]. The poetic plur. occurs since Lucretius (e.g. V 21), often in poetry, for *solācĭum*: Bednara 549. St. never employs the sing. in his poetry, once in prose: III *Praef.* 16.

202-5.: Blaesus imitates Melior: *tollit humo*: 79 *sustulit* (*exultans* there, *gaudens* 203), 81 *sinu tulit* (thus St. himself in V 5, 84 *reptantem...solo...erexi*). *Magna ligat cervice*: 51 *quo nunquam domini sine pondere cervix*, 61 *umeros circumdabit ulnis*. *Munera...porgit*: 135 *non munera cessant*, 165 *munera*.

magnaque ligat cervice: 'Fastens him about his neck', *cf.* III 2, 132-3 *me magna cervice ligatum attolles umeris*. It seems more usual to say *circum collum*, like *Th.* XII 670, Suet. *Nero* 51, *al.*: *OLD* 2b. But the abl. occurs also at *Th.* X 280-1 *ligatum...tellure*, 544-5 *ligatur vitta comis*.

On *magna*: 191-3n. (*ardua*).

diuque ipse manu gaudens vehit: Each word stresses Blaesus' enthusiasm: *diu* his friendliness and strength, *ipse* 'of his own accord', *gaudens* in spite of the sombre surroundings.

manu vehit: this must mean 'carried him on his arm', a strange expression and a strange idea: if St. means 'in his arms', this is the only place where he uses the sing. for the plur. The idea of carrying a child on the arm (let alone a 12 year-old one) does not occur elsewhere in St., and it seems an awkward position.

One natural thing to do would be to carry Glaucias on his back, his arms around Blaesus' shoulders, like Aeneas: *magna patrem cervice vehenti* III 3, 188. Then *ligat* would explain what follows and *manu* rest unexplained. More obvious still for Blaesus would be to lift Glaucias, kiss him (*ligat*) and put him on his shoulders. Saenger therefore proposed in his app. *umeris* ('?'). This has some good parallels: III 1, 178 *umeris inreptet avi*, esp. III 2, 132 above, *Ach.* I 196 *umeris se innectit Achilles*. But it is difficult from a palaeographic point of view.

Manu is sometimes used a little pleonastically by St., like 147, II 2, 11, II 6, 9, *ulnis* II 1, 66: see Vollm. on III 3, 127, *TLL* VIII 347, 27-348, 6. But to suppose that *manu vehit* means *vehit* <*cervice*> seems far-fetched.

[42] The Concordance has a lemma *solacium* (13 entrances) and another one *solatium* (11).

There is one explanation by which *manu* can be kept[43]: by the way in which Blaesus imitates Melior, he has taken his role as a father. This is especially stated in *sustulit*. Thereby the picture of the baby lifted by Melior has been recalled. Now Glaucias is, as it were, again a very small child, with a new 'father' in these lines and St. pictures him here as carried around by this father, like (for instance) the statue of Hermes carrying Dionysos in Olympia.

quae munera...Elysii: Sc. *sunt*. St. sometimes employs these short sentences without a verb: I 4, 90-1 *quae maxima...gloria* with Vollm., II 2, 4, 33, 70, II 6, 97-8n., III 3, 213 *qui maior honos, Th.* I 170, XII 194, *Ach.* I 287. See also II 2, 79-80n.

munera, together with *mollis* and *gaudens*, creates an atmosphere of joy, which is counteracted by the gloomy picture St. paints of Elysium.

steriles ramos mutasque volucres...obtunso pallentes germine flores: St. is exceptional among poets in painting Elysium as rather an unpleasant abode. This is the more strange since A) a representation of it as joyful would give more comfort, B) he is not consistent: II 6, 98 ff., II 7, 111-2 and V 3, 285-7 are positive. III 3 and V 1 are ambiguous: III 3, 23-4 *date serta per aras festaque pallentes hilarent altaria lucos* and V 1, 254 ff. *iubet...Proserpina...lumine purpureo tristes laxare tenebras sertaque et...praesternere flores* suggest that Elysium is generally gloomy, but is cheered up especially for Etruscus and Priscilla. See 8-12n.

Vollm. refers to the tradition that things in the Underworld are mere appearances, *cf.* in St. V 3, 287 *falsa dies*, 187-8n. Though that theme is related, I do not think that this passage goes ultimately back to it. If there must be a final literary example, it is rather Hom. *Od.* XI 488-91 where Achilles would prefer to be the poorest man on earth than king of the dead.

Contrast, for the opposite mood, IV 5, 9-11 (winter has passed) *frondibus...crinitur arbos, nunc volucrum novi questus...(et) carmen.*

steriles ramos...pallentes...flores: a neutral *nemus*: V 3, 286. In other authors Elysium is full of luxuriant trees, flowers and esp. meadows: Hom. *Od.* XI 539, Pind. *frg. thren.* 1 (= Plut. *Cons. Apol.* 35) φοινικορόδοις δ' ἐνι λειμώνεσσι...καὶ λιβάνῳ σκιαρὸν καὶ χρυσέοις κάρποις βεβριθός, [Plt.] *Axioch.* 371D, Aristoph. *Ran.* 326, Tib. I 3, 61-2 *totosque per agros floret odoratis terra benigna rosis*, Verg. *A.* VI 638 ff. *amoena virecta fortunatorum nemorum...gramineis...pascuntur equi...per herbam...odoratum lauris nemus...silvam...lucis habitamus opacis...et prata recentia rivis...convalle virenti*, 703-4 (see Norden on 442, Austin on 637-78, 658), ironically Lucian. *VH* II 5 ff. See also Motte 247 ff.

---

[43] I owe this suggestion to the ingenuity of Dr H. S. Versnel.

The dwelling of the blest is already described as a fertile meadow in ancient Egyptian texts, also in Germanic mythology, *cf.* Dante *Inf.* IV 118 *prato di fresca verdura* (though the inhabitants are not very cheerful: *sembianza avevan nè trista nè lieta*), see Ettig 354 n. 1, Maubert 222-5. On tombs luxuriant landscapes are often depicted: Toynbee 1971, 38-9.

pallentes: because *pallidus, pallere, pallor etc.* refer to the most characteristic colour of the Underworld: pale, decolourized: V 1, 27, IV 7, 15, *cf.* 217 here, since *trag. inc. ap.* Cic. *Tusc.* I 48 *pallida leti...loca* (*cf.* Enn. *scen.* XXXIV n. (Jocelyn)): Pease on *A.* IV 26, André 1949, 341-2.

But *pallidus* here and in III 3, 24 (above) is also connected with the tradition that Elysium is a dusky place: V 1, 254 f., also Lucian. *VH* II 5 ff. It is opposed to the general idea that Elysium is brilliant with light, as in Vergil, VFl. I 844, Sil. XIII 551: Maubert 221-4. Aus. *Cupido cruc.* 8-9 imitates St.: *nebuloso lumine marcent...flores.*

pallentes for *pāllĭdī* often in St. and others (like *algentibus* for *ālgĭdīs* I 3, 44): Fortgens on *Th.* VI 26 and Schubert 17-8.

steriles: 187-8n.

mutas...volucres: for St. Elysium is silent: II 4, 8 = II 6, 100 *silentia Lethes*, though sometimes the inhabitants sing if they are poets: II 7, 114, V 3, 27. Contrast Tib. I 3, 59-60 *cantus...vigent, passimque vagantes dulce sonant tenui gutture carmen aves*, Lucian. *VH* 5; 14, *cf.* Ov. *Am.* II 6, 49 (II 4, 8n.). Other sounds in Elysium: Verg. *A.* VI 704 *virgulta sonantia*, 709 *strepit omnis murmure campus*, VFl. I 845 *carmina*, already Pind. *frg. thren.* 1 τοὶ δὲ φορμίγγεσσι τέρπονται.

porgit: M has *porsit*, an otherwise unattested form. Even if this were the perfect of *porrigere*, the perf. tense would be out of place between *vehit* and *prohibet*, see 189-90n. Barth changed into *porgit* (and Bentley independently after him: Haupt 132 and O. Mueller 1882, 12), accepted by all editors, see Fr. *app.*

The syncopated form, instead of *porrigit*, occurs also at *Th.* VIII 754. Other instances of *syncope* in St.: Vollm. p. 557, *cf.* II 2, 127-9n.

For *por(ri)gere*, 'to present (gifts)': *OLD* 6 a, b, e.g. Hor. *S.* II 3, 258 *porrigis...poma*, Ov. *Met.* II 861 *flores...porrigit.* Otto's *promit* (1887, 532-3) is superfluous.

obtunso germine: 'Nipped in the bud', 'while the buds are (made) ineffective, sterile'. *Obtundere* is used for making dull, blunting, the various senses; see *OLD* 3b: sight, *Th.* VII 372; *OLD* 4: hearing, V 1, 171 *obtunsae...aures; OLD* 5: voice or sounds made indistinct. *Cf.* also *Th.* X 136 *obtusum iubar* = 'with dimmed rays'.

206-7. Nec...sed...et: The climax: Blaesus allows Glaucias to think of Melior (*nec*), he even embraces him (*sed*), and, most importantly (*et*), all three intertwine in love.

pectora miscere: 'To embrace': Prop. IV 7, 19, *cf.* VFl. III 310 *cornua miscere, Th.* IV 399, *OLD miscere* 3a. But it has also a more spiritual sense, 'to unite with', 'to share in' (*OLD* 9): II 2, 143, V 1, 43-4 *si vos collato pectore mixtos iunxit...Concordia.* Both share their feelings, for each other and for Melior.

blandus: 45-6n.

alternum pueri partitur amorem: In four words St. sketches an ideal picture of the eternal triangle, where harmonious love is shared by all three lovers.

Blaesus shares the love that Glaucias feels: *pueri* can be seen as a subjective gen., that is to say: Glaucias loves both Melior and Blaesus. But it can also mean that Blaesus shares the love which Glaucias feels for Melior: he loves Melior as much as Glaucias does. This love is reciprocal, *alternum* (*OLD* 5a): Blaesus and Melior both love Glaucias in their turn. Here *pueri* is felt as an objective gen. And this also means that Melior loves Blaesus as much as he loves Glaucias. Thus more or less Fr. 63 n. 2. Mozley's 'takes part in the affection of the lad' is not enough.

208-26. Arguments: See 183-234n. After the introductory admonition to stop mourning (208-9), St. employs two arguments, both very ancient and banal: **1)** everything is mortal, everybody dies (209-19), **2)** it is better to be dead than to be alive (220-6).

That everything will perish: Lucr. V 92 ff., *Epic. Drusi* 361-2, often in Sen. (e.g. *Dial.* VI 26, 6, XII 1, 2 ff.): E.-F. 151-2 § 60, esp. B, C. That everyone must die ('*allgemeines Gut der Literatur*': E.-F. 150): e.g. Hor. *Carm.* I 28, 7 ff., II 3, 28 (both with Nisbet-H.'s notes), II 14, 9 ff., Prop. III 18, 22, *Epic. Drusi* 357-60, Sen. *Dial.* VI 12, 4, XI 1-4: E.-F. *loc. cit.* A, D, E, Kassel 63, 67-8, 73-4, Soffel 210-2, for inscriptions Lattimore 250, for epitaphs Lier 1903, 563 ff., Vérilhac 148, 2; 149, 4; 150, 6, *cf.* 151, 1; 152, 4; *CE* 803, 1-2; Griessmair 90 ff. This first argument closes with a mythological *topos*: 88-102n.

The second point is argued by St. with 'life is so full of uncertainties and fears that it is better to be dead'. This is already announced in the first section by 218 *timet*, where St. could also have written 'knows that he will die'.

This argument, 'death is better, for it delivers us from the evils of life', occurs in this form apparently since Aesch. *frg.* 255, 355, see Soph. *Ant.* 462 ff., *Trach.* 1170 f., *frg.* 845 = Plut. *Cons. Apol.* 220, 14. After him e.g. Eur. *frg.* 449 N², translated *ap.* Cic. *Tusc.* I 115 and quoted by Men. 413, 25 ff. *Sp.* (who recommends alluding to it rather than quoting verbatim), Lucr. III 1085 ff., Sen. *Dial.* VI 19, 5-6, 22, 3 *etc.*: E.-F. 152 § 70, Kassel 75, 82-3, Johann 100 ff., 133, Soffel 213-5, Lier 1903,

593 ff., Griessmair 98 ff. It is very popular in the *CE*, e.g. 507, 1-3; 1274, 1-2 *morborum vitia et vitae mala maxima fugi* (2nd/3rd cent. A.D.?), 1870, 1-6. A much quoted and imitated epigram from the 1st cent. A.D. expresses the thought that it is good to have escaped from the uncertainties of life, e.g. *CE* 1498 (3rd cent A.D.) *evasi, effugi. Spes et Fortuna valete,/ nil mihi vobiscum est, ludificate alios.* See *CE* 409, 8-10; 434, 13-5; 500, 8-10; 2139, 1-2, *AP* IX 49, 1-2; IX 134, 1-3; IX 172, 1-2, Pikhaus 125-7. The *deploratio vitae* in itself is yet more old, see Johann *loc. cit.* and the literature in n. 469 there.

The first argument stresses what Glaucias and the survivors have in common (their mortal nature): *omnia* (209), *quicquid, omnes* (218). The second one stresses what divides them (he is happy, because dead, they are miserable, because alive): *ast hic* (220) ...*non timuit* (223)/ *nos anxia plebes* (223), *felix* (220)/ *nos miseri* (223), *immunis fatis* (222)/ *incertum* (225).

St., as usual, emphasizes the essential concepts by a great variety of synonyms: *functa...moritura...obeunt...mortale...caducae...interitus...exitio... letalis...exitio...finem...ibimus...mori...dies suprema...exitus...fatale.* Also *dubios, casus...caecae lubrica...fatis...anxia...incertum.*

208-9. Hic finis rapto: 'This is the end of the dead one'. Not: 'It is the end: he is lost to thee' (Mozl.).

rapere is frequent for 'to carry of' of death *etc.*: *OLD* 5. In Latin verse-inscriptions it is the most frequent word for 'killing' when referring to the intervention of the Fates or similar powers, see Pikhaus n. 110. Thus ἁρπάζω in Call. *Ep.* 2, 6 and 41, 2. See Quint. *Inst.* VI *Praef.* 4 *acerbissimis rapta fatis.* In the *Silv.*: III 3, 195, V 3, 73, 252, *cf.* III 5, 37. The pass. part. *raptus* as a subst. is rare in St. (*Th.* V 657, VII 493, *Ach.* I 47); not elsewhere in the sense 'the dead one', but see II 6, 93-5n.

Quin tu...vulnera sedas: For the injunction: 183-234n., II 6, 93-6n. For *quin* + 2nd. pers., see II 3, 12-4n. When the wound does not hurt anymore the circle of the poem will be closed (see *vulnus* 4 and n.), and the aim of persuading the survivor to exchange grief for calmness will be reached.

vulnera: the poetic plur. occurs since Lucr., who makes no difference between sing. and plur. Neither does St.: II *Praef.* 8, II 1, 4 *vulnus* = *vulnera* here, II 6, 7 *vulnera* = *vulnus* 95. Often in Verg. and Ov.: Bednara 562, Schink 137-8.

209-10. functa: 'Dead'. *Functus* as 'dead' occurs fairly often in St.: *Th.* II 15 (see Mulder), III 143, IV 483, 511, VIII 11, XI 137, 437. Before him in *Epic. Drusi* 393 (one argument for a post-Ovidian date), Sen. *Oed.* 240, 579, *Thy.* 14, 749, *Med.* 999. After him e.g. Aus. *Epigr.* 42, 5

(183n.). *(De)functus vita(m)*, 'dead' does occur earlier: *OLD fungor* 2b, c, *defungor* 3.

moritura: 52-4n.

omnia: Is divided into **1)** abstract things and dead matter: night, day, stars, the earth, **2)** mankind. The argument runs: 'Give up grieving, for everything dies, the earth itself, so why mourn mere people (*nam*)'. It is the well-known argument which Sulpicius employs to Cicero: *nos homunculi indignamur siquis nostrum interierit aut occisus est...cum uno loco tot oppidorum cadavera proiecta iacent?* Cic. *Ep.* IV 5, 4. *Omnia* is taken up after these examples by *quicquid*, but man is the case in point, so *omnes* is repeated.

210-1. obeunt...astra: St. plays with *obire*, which means 'to die, (of things) to be destroyed': *OLD* 8, e.g. Plin. *Nat.* II 95 *an obirent (stellae) an nascerentur.* But *obire* for celestial bodies (*astra*) also means 'to set' (*OLD* 9): Cic. *Arat.* 716, *Rep.* VI 22 *orientis aut obeuntis solis*, Lucr. IV 433 *in undis sol...videatur obire et condere lumen.* The sequence of night/moon, day/sun and the stars is compared to dying, which they will ultimately do. Similarly Catul. 5, 4-5 *soles occidere et redire possunt, nobis cum...occidit lux, nox est perpetua una dormienda* (same comparison used in the opposite way), Hor. *Carm.* II 18, 16 *novaeque pergunt interire lunae.*

noctesque diesque: A frequent expression: Enn. *Ann.* 338 (V.), Pl. *Amph.* 168, Hor. *S.* I 1, 76, Verg. *A.* VI 556, *cf.* *Th.* VI 335.

nec solidis prodest sua machina terris: 'Nor preserves its structure the mass of the earth'. St. imitates Lucr. V 95-6 *multosque per annos sustentata ruat moles et machina mundi*: *moles* is represented by *solidis* and *machina mundi* becomes *machina terris* (Bailey on Lucr. 'the *mundus* is not only a mass of matter, *moles*, but a complex construction, *machina*'). St. employs *machina caeli* in III 1, 181, *Th.* VII 812, VIII 310. For this meaning 'structure': Man. II 807 *dissociata fluat resoluto machina mundo*, Luc. I 79, *Aetna* 230.

St. alludes to an *ekpyrosis* of the universe. This is both Stoic and Epicurean. St. appears, rather than taking a philosophic point of view, to use a literary topic (Lucr. V 93 ff., 1000, 1148). In much the same way Ovid pays his tribute to Lucr.: *Tr.* II 425 (with Luck's note), *Am.* I 15, 23-4, *Met.* I 256 ff. *adfore tempus quo...mundi moles operosa laboret.*

212-3. populus: 'Mankind', see *Th.* II 28 *Cerberus...saevus...intranti populo*, plur.: *Th.* VIII 334, 375-6 *fatalem populis ultro poscentibus horam/ admovet atra dies*, *cf.* Hor. *Carm.* II 13, 19 *leti vis rapuit rapietque gentis.* It is easier for St. to use *populus* in this way, because *populus plebsque* is a standing expression, e.g. Cic. *Mur.* 1 *populo plebique Romano, OLD populus* 2c.

mortale genus: Sc. <*est*> (202-5n.). For the expression: *Th.* XI 470 *mortale genus,* Lucr. I 1015, Ov. *Met.* I 188, 260, *CIL* XI 6753, *muliebre genus* Lucr. V 1355, *Medea reddet feminas dirum genus* Sen. *Phaed.* 564.

caducae: 'Destined to die, transitory', *cf.* II 2, 129, Verg. *A.* X 622 *caduco...iuveni, OLD* 7, 8.

213-8. A catalogue of causes of death: As Asprenas says in Sen. *Con.* I 8, 6 *totidem ad mortem viae sunt.* The theme is old: Semon. 1, 12 ff. (7th/6th Cent. B.C.) τοὺς δὲ δύστηνοι νόσοι/ φθείρουσι †θνητῶν†· τοὺς δ' Ἄρει δεδμεμένους/ πέμπει μελαίνης Ἀίδης ὑπὸ χθονός,/ οἱ δ' ἐν θαλάσσῃ λαιλάπι κλονεύμενοι/ ...θνῄσκουσιν. It was popular in literature, rhetoric and philosophy: Hor. *Carm.* I 28, 17-8, *cf.* II 14, 13-6, Luc. II 199-200, Sen. *Phaed.* 475-6. Rhetoric: Sen. *Con.* VII 1, 9. 'Philosophy': Sen. *Dial.* VI 10, 6 (*ignis, bellum, mare, morbi*), see 10, 3 and 11, 4, *Ep.* 70, 14, Firm. *Mathes.* I 9, 1.

Mare and *bellum/ferrum* are most often mentioned. The theme was inevitably parodied by Petr. 115 *maria...arma...vehiculo lapsus* (*!*)...*cibus avidum strangulavit, abstinentem frugalitas.* See also the catalogue of possibilities for suicide in Sen. *Dial.* V 15, 4 and Motto *s.v.* Death n° 18. Dependent hereupon: Firm. *Mathes.* I 7, 2-3.

Vollm. claims that *ut sileam* betrays the rhetoric origin of this catalogue. But this is disproved by the poem of Semonides. On *ut sileam*: 88-102n., 96n.

St. has distributed the causes of death into three kinds: *bella, aequora* with *hos,* then *amor, furor, cupido* (original in this context) with *his,* and finally *morbos* with *ut sileam*; these again tripartite: illness caused by winter/cold, summer/heat, autumn/rain.

poscunt: 'To demand for punishment', e.g. Verg. *A.* II 121 *quem poscat Apollo,* Ov. *Met.* XI 212 *filia monstro poscitur,* Tac. *Hist.* IV 40 *Macer ad exitium poscebatur, OLD* 3b; for the abstract subject: *ibid.* 7.

aequora: The poetic plur. already in Enn. *Ann.* 478 (V.), πελάγη in Homer. Often in Ov.: Bednara 555. St. does not exclude *aequor* (16), but prefers *aequora* to it (39), e.g. *super aequor Th.* IV 24, *super aequora* III 4, 5. In the abl./dat. he employs only the sing., apart from *Ach.* II 13.

amor...furor...cupido: Remind of Lucr. IV 1058 ff., the attack on the passion of love, e.g. *furor* 1069, 1117, *rabies* 1083, 1117, *dira cuppedine* 1090, esp. since love as one cause of death is not mentioned in other catalogues.

saeva cupido: Markl. conjectured *caeca,* referring to Lucr. III 59 and others. *Saeva cupido* is rare indeed: *TLL* III 1423, 66 ff. has only one instance among many *iuncturae*: Juv. 14, 175 (where Markl. also prefers *caeca*). But *dira* and *insana* are common with *cupido,* and, moreover, *cupido* is *saeva* here because it kills, *cf.* 169, 190, II 6, 32, 81, II 7, 89, 92 *etc.*

ut sileam: Though not in itself proving a rhetoric origin for the whole passage, it is in fact a very unpoetical turn: not in Lucr., Catul., Tib., Prop., Verg., Hor., Luc., VFl., Sil., elsewhere in St. It is only found in Ov. *Pont.* I 2, 147. Something like it: Verg. *A.* III 39 *eloquar an sileam*, X 793 *nec te...silebo*, Hor. *Carm.* I 12, 21, Ov. *Met.* IX 147 *conquerar an sileam?*, Sil. XVII 610.

215-7. Brumae...Sirius...Autumnus: The noxious influence of the seasons other than spring is often mentioned: Bion 2, 12-4 οὐκ ἐθέλω θέρος ἦμεν, ἐπεὶ τόκα μ' ἅλιος ὀπτῇ·/οὐκ ἐθέλω φθινόπωρον, ἐπεὶ νόσον ὥρια τίκτει./οὖλον χεῖμα φέρει νιφετόν, κρυμῶς δὲ φοβεῦμαι. For the individual seasons, see below. As Sen. says (*Dial.* VI 11, 3), man is *frigoris, aestus...impatiens.*

The seasons are also frequently enumerated in other contexts, often personified, esp. in the visual arts, with a peak in Hellenistic art: Bömer on Ov. *Met.* II 27. St. may be reminded of such representations: *ora, hiatus.*

Brumae: the personification occurs only here and perhaps in *Th.* VII 286, elsewhere always as *hiems*: *TLL* II 2208, 82. Its gaping mouth: *Th.* I 378-9 *venturaque rauco ore minatur hiems* and on *hiatus* below. It is *rigentia*, frozen (e.g. *Th.* X 497-8 *rigidi...Eurotae*), to symbolize that winter freezes, *cf.* Luc. I 17 *bruma rigens*, VI 478, IX 874, Petr. 132, 8 vs. 5; *rigidus Boreas*: *PLM* IV p. 125, *gelidus Boreas*: *Th.* I 193, Ov. *Am.* II 11, 10, *Tr.* I 2, 29, Sen. *Phaed.* 936.

bruma means winter (originally the shortest day of the year) since Lucr. V 746 and invariably in St., so the *synecdoche* is not felt anymore (Lunderstedt 10 is incomplete and superfluous.).

Sirius: his scorching heat: I 3, 5, III 1, 54, *Th.* I 634-5, Ap. Rhod. II 518 ff., Verg. *G.* IV 425, *A.* III 141, esp. X 272 ff. *ille sitim morbosque ferens mortalibus aegris* (274), Tib. I 7, 21, Germ. *fr.* 4, 41 *letifer...Sirius*, Plin. *Nat.* VIII 152, VFl. V 368-9 *asperat ignis/ Sirius.*

igni: St. has *igni* 6 times (*Th.* V 194, XII 275, *Ach.* I 657, *Silv.* III 3, 104 (*igne* in 105), V 3, 204) and far more often *igne*, see Housman 1933, 70 and Neue-W. I 303, 340-1. Since *igni* occurs four times out of the six at the end of the verse, it is not necessitated by metre. Probably euphony plays an (unexplained) part.

Autumnus: for the personification: *TLL* II 1605, 7 ff., *RE* II 2613-4. Though it is often represented as the time of harvest and vintage, it is also considered as an unhealthy season: Hippocr. *aph.* II 9 ἐν φθινοπώρῳ ὀξύταται αἱ νοῦσοι καὶ θανατωδέσταται. It was *gravis*: Hor. *S.* II 6, 19, *letifer* Juv. 4, 56-7 (*cf.* 10, 221, Hor. *Ep.* I 7, 1 ff.). Sometimes it is the hot wind which is accused (Porphyrio on Hor. *Ep.* I 16, 16), sometimes the cold

(e.g. Verg. *G.* II 231, *A.* VI 309). Rain and wind: Hor. *Carm.* II 14, 15-6 *per autumnos nocentem corporibus metuemus Austrum, S. loc. cit.*, Grat. 149, Germ. *fr.* 4, 97, Col. I *Praef.* 23, *TLL* II 1604, 10 ff., Waszink on Tert. *An.* 48, 1, Nisbet-H. on Hor. *Carm. loc. cit.*

pallens: For death (204-5n) and illness (Verg. *A.* VI 275 *pallentes morbi*); in the last case as cause for effect like *rigentia*, see Quint. Inst. VIII 6, 27. St. probably also employs *pallens* because winter and cold are associated with *pallor*: V 1, 128 *pallida frigora, Th.* II 421 *refugo pallentis sole Gelonos*, VII 286 *pallida bruma.*

hiatu: The winds are often represented with wide open mouths: *Th.* I 352-3 *asper hiatu...Boreas*, VII 37 *Aquilonis hiatus* and Lactantius there, VFl. I 594 (*Aeolus*) *iam cohibere frementum* (sc. *ventorum*) *ora nequit*, Mart. VII 37, 6 *flaret madida fauce December.*

St. may also think of the *hiatus mortis*, since Autumn is lethal: *Th.* VIII 378 *nigro...viros invitat hiatu*, Sen. *Oed.* 164, *Anth. Lat.* 477, 5, Ter. Maur. 1294, Arn. *Nat.* II 32 p. 74, 11: *TLL* VI 2683, 73-2684, 7[44].

218-9. init ortus: Perfect tense: *inīt* = *iniit*, like *Th.* XI 124. Thus *abīt* I 6, 92, *subīt* IV 3, 130, V 1, 258, *Th.* III 209, X 150, *coīt Th.* VIII 332, *Ach.* I 458, *perīt Th.* X 323, *cf.* 153-7n. *subivit.*

init ortus means 'has a beginning'. Latin expressions for beginning are often pleonastic as here, e.g. *incohandi exordium* (Enn. *scen.* 248-9), *prima...origine* (Verg. *A.* I 372), see *LHSz.* 793, Austin on Verg. *loc. cit.* and II 40, Gudeman on Tac. *Dial.* 11, 3, Löfstedt 1956², 179-80.

But this pleonasm is not found elsewhere with *inire* or *ortus*, see also *TLL* VII 1295, 49 ff. Expressed the other way round: Ter. *Hec.* 351 *initium oritur*, Cic. *Clu.* 180 *initio orto.* Moreover *inire* of beginning (a phase of) life is always transitive, except for *Th.* I 571, see *TLL* VII 1297, 55 ff. The best parallel is Sen. *Dial.* I 2, 12 *mors initur*[45]. For the sense: Sen. *Ep.* 99, 8 *cui nasci contigit, mori restat, CE* 1576, 8 *cui contigit nasci, instat et mori.*

Ibimus...ibimus: An imitation of Hor. *Carm.* II 17, 10-2 *ibimus, ibimus...supremum carpere iter* and II 3, 25-6 *omnes eodem cogimur, omnium versatur urna*, see *Epic. Drusi* 357-60 *fata manent omnis...tendimus hoc omnes...omnia sub leges Mors vocat atra suas*, Pers. 3, 41-2 *imus, imus praecipites*, all with the same anaphora, meant to move, *cf.* Nisbet-H. on Hor. *Carm.* II 14, 1. For the thought: 208-26n., Ov. *Met.* X 32 ff. *omnia debemur vobis...tendimus huc omnes.*

---

[44] *Aetna* 171 appears in *TLL* as the first instance of the open jaws of the winds. But *hiatus* there is either corrupt (Goodyear) or means something else (Vessereau).

[45] *TLL* VII 1298, 3 ff. unsatisfactorily puts our line under '*res graves vel periculosas inire*'.

ire: Used absolutely, 'to die'. Baehrens (1914, 98) claims that Lucr. III 526 *hominem paulatim cernimus ire* and this line are the only classical instances of this use of *ire.* It is probably vulgar, see Donat. on Verg. *A.* III 10. But the idea of a road to the Underworld, as in Hor. *Carm.* II 17 above and elsewhere is connected, I think, with this use of *ire* by St., *cf.* Catul. 3, 11 *qui nunc it per iter tenebricosum*, and Nisbet-H. on Hor. *Carm.* I 28, 16. For Greek grave-inscriptions: Vérilhac no. 23 and p. 42. For Latin metrical grave-inscriptions: Pikhaus 69 with n. 156, 74 with n. 164.

Aeacus: The father of Peleus, represented as a judge in the Underworld since Plt. *Gorg.* 524a, *Apol.* 41a: *Silv.* III 3, 16 (*si quis*) *inferna rigidum timet Aeacon urna*, e.g. Hor. *Carm.* II 13, 22 (with Nisbet-H.), Verg. *A.* VI 432, Prop. IV 11, 19, Ov. *Met.* IX 435.

He has an urn with him either to decide by lot which case comes next (Camps on Prop. IV 11, 20), e.g. Sen. *Ag.* 24 *quaesitor urna Gnosius versat reos*, or to draw the names of the jurors (Norden on *A.* VI 432). In Hor. *Carm.* II 3 above and III 1, 16 the urn is a symbol that everyone's lot to die will finally turn up. This is unconnected with its use here (*pace* Nisbet-H. on II 3).

immensis...umbris: 'Innumerable shades'. This is one of the earliest instances of fusion in sense between words indicating size and those indicating quantity, see Löfstedt 1911, 148-9. He gives earlier instances only for *tot/tantus* and *quot/quantus.* For *innumerus/immensus*, see *Th.* IV 637-8 *innumero agmine*, VI 497 *innumera formidine, Ach.* I 958 *ingentes famulas*, see *TLL* VII[1] 1538, 21, Håk. 1973, 74-5. So Lundström's *innumeris* (67) is superfluous, let alone *ulnis* (σ) or *antris* (Saenger) for *umbris.* See also II 3, 62-3n.

220-2. Ast: In Enn. and Pl. it has the meaning of *at* (German *sondern*): *neque...ast.* In Augustan poetry and in prose after Petr. it comes into use as a synonym of *sed* in all senses, because of its metrical advantages. It is used almost exclusively before vocals (not at *Th.* II 668, Verg. *A.* X 743, Ov. *Met.* VII 241, Sil. XI 190).

St. has it 6 times in the *Silvae*: I 2, 79, I 4, 19, here, III 1, 61, III 2, 142, IV 2, 5 and about 25 times in the epics. See Vollm. on I 4, 19, Norden on *A.* VI 316, *LHSz.* 489.

felix: Sharply juxtaposed with *gemimus.* In the first place to stress the idea *vita malum, bonum mors.* The dead are also called 'blest' in III 3, 25-6 *felix a nimium felix...umbra*, V 1, 193, 220-1, Theocr. 2, 70 ἁ μακαρῖτις, Verg. *A.* VI 669.

hominesque deosque: = Verg. *A.* I 229, II 745-6 *hominumque deorum/que*, Hor. *Carm.* I 12, 14 *res hominum ac deorum.* The combination *homines et*

dei is, of course, very frequent. But *TLL* VI[3] 2875, 49-2876, 16 gives few instances from poetry. Glaucias has escaped the evil deeds which human beings and gods can do, see *Th.* IV 577-8 *iuvat effugisse deorum numina.* But, I think St. also employs the formula *hominesque deosque* somewhat mechanically here, *cf.* Hom. *Il.* II 669 ὅς τε θεοῖσι καὶ ἀνθρώποισιν ἀνάσσει. For these polar expressions (II 2, 125 *spemque metumque*) Nisbet-H. on Hor. *loc. cit.* refer to E. Kemmer, *Die polare Ausdrucksweise* (1903), 77 ff.

-que...-que is not very frequent in *Silv.* II: here, 178, 210, II 2, 63, 125, II 5, 23, 25, 34, II 6, 52(n.), 67, 104.

lubrica vitae: 'The slippery ground of life'. The metaphor is esp. frequent in Tac.: *Ann.* VI 49, 3 *lubricum iuventae,* XIV 56, 2, *cf.* VI 51, 3, XIII 2, 2, Plin. *Ep.* III 3, 4 *in hoc lubrico aetatis,* Apul. *Met.* XI 15, 1 *lubrico...aetatulae.* St. is, together with Fronto p. 154, 3 vdH., the only non-Christian author to use the neuter plur.: *TLL* VII[2] 1688, 66 ff.

dubios: II 2, 127.

immunis Fatis: 'Free from the influence of Fate', *cf.* II 2, 126 *exemptus Fatis.* See Pikhaus 125 with n. 321. For the sense of *immunis*: *OLD* 4. The gen. is original with it (thence, perhaps, *fati*: σ), as in *Th.* V 123. The abl. goes with it since Verg., probably on analogy of *orbus*: *Th.* VI 152 *immunem Furiis,* Vell. II 35, 2, Luc. II 257 *al.* With *ab*: *Th.* V 643, Vell. II 14, 3, Sen. *Ep.* 95, 18. See *OLD loc. cit., LHSz.* 78, 107, *TLL* VII[1] 505, 75 ff.

222-6. Non...rogavit, non timuit meruitve: The first two go together: Glaucias has neither wished death nor feared it, *cf.* Sen. *Ep.* 24, 22 *obiurgat Epicurus non minus eos qui mortem concupissent quam eos qui timent,* Mart. X 47, 13 *summum nec metuas diem nec optes.* Though Mart. shows that this is a poetic as well as a philosophic commonplace, it seems esp. popular in Epicurean philosophy, see II 2, 128 ff. with the same opposition 'you/we', Usener 496-503, Diog.L. X 124, Cic. *Tusc.* I 62.

It is virtually only *non timuit* which is developed in 223-6: *anxia...incertum. Meruit* follows somewhat strangely, since it is not much of a comfort to say that Glaucias had not deserved to die. This is not solved by referring to 177 *immeritus* (Vollm.), where grief is at its most intense.

Heinsius' conjecture *renuit* (*Advers.* IV *c.* 6. Markl. makes it look as if it is his own) is attractive: he did not ask nor fear to die, nor try to escape when death came. A good parallel (by Markl.) is Sen. *Nat.* VI 32, 6 *nec rogaveris, nec timueris, nec te velut in aliquod malum exiturum tuleris retro.* The inf. with *renuere*: Sil. XI 61, XVII 24. It occurs twice in St., without a following inf., but I do not see why it should be *minus Papinianum* (Phill. *in app. crit.*).

Nevertheless *meruit* can be kept: it may be defended by reference to Plut. *Cons. Apol.* 25 = Krantor *frg.* 11, where Krantor says that it is a comfort when the deceased was a virtuous man. And that is what St. himself says with 229 *insontes.* He means that Glaucias did not wish for death since his life had been good. For a detailed interpretation of Plut. and Krantor: Kassel 90, esp. Johann 32-4.

incertum: Is the main concept of the sentence: life is uncertain. Around *incertum* it is structured in pairs: anxiety in *nos anxia...nos miseri*, explained in two questions: 'when shall we die?' 224-5, 'how shall we die?' 225-6. Both are bipartite: *dies, aevum* and *fulmen, nubes*, and varied: *unde, quis...anxia* (sing.), *miseri* (plur.)...*quibus ab astris, quae nubes.*

For the construction *nos quibus incertum est unde dies suprema ventura sit*, see Cic. *Clu.* 63 *si incertum fuisset quisnam exitus...futurus esset*, Verg. *G.* I 24-5 *tu...quem...quae sint habitura...concilia incertum est*, Cels. III 12, 1 *incertum est...quando febris ventura sit*, Tac. *Ann.* XVI 26, *OLD* 6b. Examples of *incertum...-ne...an* and *dubium (ne)...an*: Vollm. on IV 4, 21, *LHSz.* 537.

For the thought: Lucr. III 1085-6 *posteraque in dubiost fortunam quam vehit aetas, / quidve ferat nobis casus quive exitus instet*, see 983 *casumque timent quem cuique ferat fors.* For the desire for knowledge about these facts: *Th.* III 555-7 *eruimus quae prima dies, ubi terminus aevi/ quid...deum genitor, quid ferrea Clotho/ cogitet.*

nos anxia plebes, nos miseri: *Th.* III 563 *nos pravum et flebile vulgus*, II 2, 129.

dies suprema: II 2, 128 *suprema dies.*

Dies is both *fem. generis* and *masc. generis* in St. and other poets. In *Silv.* II *masc.*: *Praef.* 25, II 6, 13, II 7, 1, 121; *fem.*: II 2, 48, 128, II 7, 20.

Verg. employs the *fem.* in the nominative, but only if this form offers metrical advantage over the *masc.* (and thus never has *illa dies*, since *ille dies* is metrically equivalent; but *summa dies* must be preferred to the metrically impossible *summus dies*). He employs the *masc.* in the oblique cases: Austin on *A.* II 324. This holds good partly for St.: the *fem.* does not occur in the oblique cases[46]. But he has also *illa dies*: III 2, 127, V 3, 230, *ista dies* II 7, 20.

Sometimes *dies* is claimed to be *fem. gen.* if it means *tempus* (the ancient grammarians, followed by Skutsch and Brugmann). Ed. Fraenkel (1917) has tried to modify this, in an effort to show that the *fem.* originally signifies the last day of a set termin. But he must conclude that in poetry metrical convenience plays an important part, and that even in prose there are so many different influences that the sum of it seems '*In univer-*

---

[46] This is an extra argument against the conjectures *patulam diem* II 7, 14, *diem beatam* I 6, 7 (both in Phill.'s text and thence in the Concordance).

sum per totam latinitatem certa norma de generibus investigari nequit': *TLL* V[1] 1023, 66 (see the whole treatment there: 1022, 75-1024, 46).

The table in *TLL* (1024, 5 ff.) shows that most poets have a slight preference for *dies* as *masc.*, except for St. (34/47) and, more markedly, Ov. (44/105). For the variation, see also Hirst 149-50.

exitus aevi: 'The end of our life': *Th.* II 17 *gravis exitus aevi* with Mulder's note. For *exitus*, see V 3, 260, Verg. *A.* X 630; for *aevi* III 1, 180 *terminus aevi*, IV 2, 13, V 1, 260, Verg. *A.* X 582 *belli finis et aevi, OLD* 6a.

fulmen: For its connotation 'disaster, disastrous death': 30n.

fatale sonans: II 2, 137 *iuvenile calens*, 6, 76 *letale favens*, IV 4, 84 *letale minari, Th.* XII 760 *letale furens*. The adverbial adj. often with *sonare*, e.g. Verg. *G.* III 329, *A.* VI 50 *mortale sonans*: Priess 31. See also II 4, 13 *argutum stridentia* and Vollm. on III 1, 40 with a list of 14 cognate accusatives in the *Silvae.*

226-34. Invocation of Glaucias: The address to Melior (226-7) points back to 208-9 and encloses the argumentative part, leading over to a climax: the request to Glaucias himself to appear. This is the strongest argument possible, based on two *topoi*: **1)** The dead one himself does not want the survivor to grieve: 148-53n. (end), II 6, 93-5n., 96n., *Epic. Drusi* 467-8, *cf.* Cic. *Sen.* 73, Sen. *Dial.* XII 5, 1-3, often in the *carmina epigraphica*: e.g. 971, 12-3; 1211, 11-2; 1212, 15-6 *sum defleta satis, finem decet esse dolori.* See Pikhaus 66, E.-F. 150 § 57. The idea that the dead are harmed by too much weeping of the survivors occurs in many cultures: Meuli 389-90 with n. 1. **2)** The comfort given by the appearance of the loved one in dreams. This is very ancient, since Hom. *Il.* XXIII 59 ff. (Patroclus appears to Achilles), Plt. *Menex.* 246d ff., Eur. *Alc.* 354 ff. In Latin: Verg. *A.* II 270-97, Prop. IV 7, 3-4, 87-92, IV 11 as a whole, Tib. II 6, 37-40, Ov. *Met.* XI 585 ff., *Ep.* 13, 107 ff., *Ibis* 153-4, *CE* 1109, 15 ff., 1515, 10 ff., Sen. *Dial.* VI 26, 1-7, Ambr. *Exc. Sat.* I 72 ff., Hier. *Ep.* 39, 6, Aus. *Epic. in patr., CIL* VI 18817, 9 ff.: E.-F. 149 § 54, *cf.* 143 § 42 B.h., Mende 107-8. This theme is not only found in literature: in the first-century testament of Epikrates, preserved on stone, the author founds a cult for his long-dead son ὀνείροις καὶ σημείοις καὶ φαντάσμασιν αὐτοῦ μοι τοῦ ἥρωος (the dead son) ἐναργῶς πολλάκις ἐπιφοιτῶντος (l. 34-5), see P. Herrmann 28 and commentary on ll. 48 ff., and for the psychological origin of the idea Meuli 316 with n. 2: fear and guilt with regard to the dead one, whom one has recently seen and laid out, makes him all-powerful and present everywhere. See 166n.

The appearance of the dead one is often mentioned in Sts.' *consolationes*: here, II 7, 120 ff., III 3, 204, V 3, 288-90[47], generally with a

[47] Vollm. (and Mende after him) for unknown reasons quotes also II 6, 93.

special aim expressed: by appearing, the dead one will live on (here 231-3). He will comfort the survivor: 230-1, see *Epic. Drusi* 445-70. He will teach the survivor: III 3, 204, V 3, 288-90.

St. in more than one way charges the end of his poem with emotion: by ending it with an apostrophe to the dead one (with a kind of *prosopopoiia*), and by calling him for the first time by his name (227-30n.): by the fiction that the poet himself is unable to give the final comfort; this must be done by the loved one: by the negation of Glaucias' death: he must appear *vivis vultibus* and declare that he has not perished (232-3). St. ends by commending the family of the deceased to Melior. By doing that he does not use, but subtly alludes to, the *topos* 'there will be a second Glaucias' (II 6, 103-5n.); and he comes back to the subject parents/children: the last word of the poem is *parentes*, in the first line one reads *alumni*. Thus at the end one of the central paradoxes of the poem is denied by the implied assertion that it is not Melior's real son who has died.

226-7. istis: Sc. *argumentis*. This independent use occurs also at *Ach.* II 156 *in istis sudor.* The neuter plur. of *iste* is never employed adjectivally by St., except for *Th.* III 364. For a list of pronouns used substantivally in the neuter plur., see Vollm. in V 1, 1, e.g. I 3, 95 *haec*, I 5, 61 *talia*, 64 *ista*, V 1, 186 *ista*, V 5, 1 *ulla*.

flectĕris...flectēre: On verbal parataxis (*genite et geniture*, Verg. *A.* IX 639), see *LHSz.* 708.

For *flectere*: IV 1, 34 *flectere tamen.*

227-30. Ades huc: Like a god (178-82n.): III 1, 28 *huc ades* (*Hercules*), see 112, III 3, 6 (*Pietas*), 12 (*dique hominesque*), see IV 8, 61-2 *si...Caesaris adsint numina*, V 1, 24-5 (*Orpheus*), V 2, 154 (*numina principis*), see I 6, 7 (*Saturnus, December, Ioci, Sales*), *Th.* I 81 *huc ades* (*Tisiphone*), *OLD* 13. For the dead: II 7, 120 (n.; Lucan's *genius*), see Tib. I 7, 49 *huc ades.*

emissus ab atro limine: Verg. *A.* VI 897-8 *natum Anchises... porta...emittit eburna, Epic. Drusi* 445 *emissus...litus Averni.* The idea in *emittere* of 'releasing from custody' (*OLD* 2a) is taken up by *nec portitor arcet.*

For *limine*: II 7, 122, for *atro*: 19-21n. and André 1949, 50-2.

cui sola facultas: 'The only one able to obtain everything (from Melior)': *Th.* III 296 *soli cui tanta potestas.* For the fact: esp. 56 ff., 234 *qui potes.*

Glaucia: This is the first and only time that the boy's name is mentioned, see 1-3n., 52-4n. (*tibi*), 102-5n., 166-8n. The mentioning of a name often heightens the pathos. St. employs the same technique in II 5, 30 *leonis* (last word of the poem), II 6, 103 *Phileton.* In II 3 *Melior* is in the

first line, *Blaesus* in the last one, *cf.* *Etruscae* III 3, 207, *Lysippe* IV 6, 109. The name of Sts.' *deliciae* may have been mentioned at the end of V 5, but does not, anyway, occur in what is left of the poem. Likewise Sen. *Dial.* VI postpones the name of Marcia's dead son until 16, 9 *Metilii tui.*

In ancient poetry a name is generally mentioned at the end if it is not named in the beginning: Abel 23. But it is more specifically a technique of Hellenistic poetry to postpone the name of the hero till the end of the story. This is often done by Ovid in the *Met.*: I 182 ff., 451, 624, II 259, 632, III 252, 308, VI 391, *al.*, see Bömer on III 138-252 with literature.

Glaucia insontes: This is a striking *hiatus*, and it has been attacked by many critics: see for a discussion esp. Housman 1906, 41 and Håk. 52-3.

Q^2 has *nam insontes*, accepted by Baehr., Housman and Postg. But this elision is found nowhere else in St.: Vollm. p. 559. Saenger has *nil sontes*, improved upon by Håk. who writes *non sontes*, quoting parallels like *Th.* V 462 *non speratis* for *insperatis*, see Luc. I 634 *non fanda* for *infanda.* Other suggestions: *Glaucia es insontes*: Unger (1868, 250), *si insontes*: Macnaghten 133, *o puer* or the like: Courtney (1968, 55), who thinks that *Glaucia* is a gloss, but see above.

I think the *hiatus* can stand. Martial calls the boy both *Glaucias*, a Greek name (VI 28, 4) and *Glauciă*, a latinized form (VI 29, 4). If St. calls him *Glaucias*, the vocative is *Glauciā*, and it would be shortened before the next vocal here. This is a Greek practice rarely followed in Latin, but see Verg. *Ecl.* 2, 65; 6, 44; 8, 108, *G.* I 281, 437, IV 461, *A.* III 211, VI 507. Housman protests that Vergil writes *Peliŏ Ossam* (*G.* I 281), whereas St. writes *Pelion Ossae* III 2, 65. But this is merely one instance. I think that St. could have followed Vergil's *Glaucŏ et* (*G.* I 437) here. He is idiosyncratic also in his scansion of *Nemeā* (nom.): *Th.* I 355, see Heuvel's note and Prisc. 292, 93*K.*, and of *deesse* (135-6n.).

If St., on the other hand, called the boy *Glauciă*, the voc. *Glauciă* would be *in hiatu.* A short open vowel *in hiatu* is extremely rare indeed, see Goold 1969, 189 ff., esp. 194. Fr. quotes Ter. *Hau.* 688 *Cliniă age*, but examples from comedy do not prove much here. There seem to be only three reliable instances in classical Latin: Verg. *Ecl.* 2, 53 *Addam cerea prună. Honos...*, *A.* I 405 *et vera incessu patuit deă. Ille...*, Pers. 3, 66 *discitĕ, o miseri.*

I think it is impossible to decide which of these two metrical practices St. himself thought he followed. In either case he certainly meant to draw attention to this line, with its breathless *Glaucia.* As Vergil 'seems to show metrically Aeneas' moment of suspense...' (Austin on *A.* I 405), thus St., I think, wants to release a final emotion in Melior, a kind of *katharsis.* Marastoni (1958, 18) calls it an atmosphere of '*affettuoso e commosso addio*'.

nec...arcet: The idea that the powers of the Underworld will grant a short return (or forbid it) occurs elsewhere: II 7, 121 ff., V 3, 59-63 and 274-5, *Epic. Drusi* 446, *cf.* Verg. *G.* IV 483, Hor. *Carm.* II 13, 33 ff., III 11, 13 ff., Prop. IV 11, 3-4, *CIL* VI 18817, 9 ff.: E.-F. 149 § 54 E.

nec portitor...nec durae comes ille ferae: On *portitor* = Charon: 186n. He is not mentioned elsewhere as preventing the shades from returning.

The *durae comes...ferae* (M's reading) has produced widely diverging interpretations and emendations. An excellent survey: Håk. 53-5.

The *dura fera* can only be Cerberus: same context in V 3, 59, *Th.* II 26 ff., IV 487, see Håk. 54. Mozl. and *OLD* (*comes* 2a) follow Slater in interpreting *fera* as Hydra and *comes* as Cerberus, as was already supposed by Poliziano. But this is as unfounded as it is improbable. The question is: who is Cerberus' comrade?

Gronovius and Fr. think of Aeacus, a doorman of the Underworld (*RE* I 1894, 926, see van Dam 388 n. 27). Vollm. explains as Briareus (Sil. XIII 587) or someone like him (Luc. VI 702 ff.). Klotz emendates to *illa*, and thinks that *comes* = Furia, while Poliziano thinks that *comes* = Cerberus and *fera* = Furia.

I agree with Håk. that the expression is much too vague to offer such a specific riddle, and that something must be hidden which means not more than Cerberus. This must be *durae comes ille serae*, proposed by Housman (1906, 42), and before him by Scaliger in a marginal note (van Dam 388). For the bar of Cerberus: Prop. IV 7, 89-90 *errat et abiecta Cerberus ipse sera*, IV 11, 25. For *dura*: Tib. I 2, 6 *dura ianua fulta sera.* For this use of *comes*: *Th.* III 506 (the raven) *comes obscurus tripodum* and Håk. *loc. cit.*

For the expression as a whole: *Th.* II 469 *Oeneae vindex...ille Dianae* (the Caledonian boar), XI 66 *caeruleae dux ille comae* (the chief snake of Tisiphone).

230-4. Tu...imple: Glaucias says he has not perished (233), which he shows by doing the things he did when alive: *pectora mulce* = 56-7 *mulcebit pectora, dulcibus alloquiis* = 56 *conloquiis amatis, prohibe manare genas*: see 57-9. This going on of life is also suggested by *perge* 234.

genas: 'Eyes'. Frequent in St. In the *Silvae*: II 7, 133, V 1, 34, 174, V 4, 8, V 5, 85. For a collection of all places in St.: Mulder on *Th.* II 232, Lunderstedt 19 (incomplete), Klotz 1908, 411. No one mentions this verse; but that St. does not mean 'cheeks' ('*défends lui de mouiller ses joues*': Fr.), but eyes, is shown by V 5, 44 *manantis oculos* = *Th.* IV 27. II 7, 133-4 *genis...manent...lacrimae* is interpreted as 'eyes' by everyone. For the inf. with *prohibere*: *LHSz.* 356, Krebs-Schmalz II 359-60.

The metonymy occurs since Enn. *Ann.* 532 *pandite...genas*, often in Augustan poetry: Norden and Austin on *A.* VI 686, Mulder *loc. cit.*, *TLL* VI^2 1766, 176 ff.

beatas: Proleptic. For the expression: Luc. VII 28 *unde pares somnos populis noctemque beatam?*

dulcibus alloquiis: 'Comforting words': *Th.* VI 46-7 *solatur...alloquiis*, Hor. *Epod.* 13, 17-8 *malum...levato...dulcibus alloquiis*, Liv. IX 6, 8, *OLD alloquium* 2.

vivis vultibus: 'With living countenance'. This points to Glaucias surviving. It seems also a reference to a statue or portrait made of him as was kept by people: 191-3n., II 7, 128-31n. The expression *vivi vultus* is frequently used for lifelike portraits, notably Verg. *A.* VI 848 and *Th.* II 216 with Mulder's note, *cf.* II 2, 64-7n.

The poetic plur. in abl./dat. occurs since Ov. *Ars* II 202: Bednara 563.

sororem...parentes: It is not Melior himself anymore, but Glaucias' real family which is mourning. Two implications are behind this: **1)** Melior's grief is cured and the poem, having reached its aim, can finish. **2)** The rest of Glaucias' family is politely recommended to Melior's care. This is a thought akin to the topos 'there will be a new *deliciae*' (226-34n.). But this recommendation is in itself unique in St., and was possibly prompted by the circumstances: Melior may already have shown them his increased favour after Glaucias' death.

desolatam...miseros: Both standard for mourning: *CE* 1109, 5 *me desolatum, me desertum ac spoliatum* (Flavian), *CIL* VI 10703 *qe me desolasti vale virgo*, XIII 2221, 2299. It is not Melior's house which is desolate any more (67), for he is comforted now. For *miser*: V 5, 1, *Th.* XI 607, *al.*

The grief of a sister: *CE* 1119, 5 *maeret cara soror quae fratrem luget ademptum.*

insinuare: 'To introduce into the favour, affection etc.' Plin. *Pan.* 62, 2 *illos animo Caesaris insinuavit*, Suet. *Cal.* 12, 2 *insinuatus Macroni, Otho* 2, 2 *insinuatus Neroni, vita Hor.* p. 44 *primo Maecenati, mox Augusto insinuatus*, see *Th.* V 447-8 *pulchraeque insignia gentis mentibus insinuat*, Sen. *Ep.* 95, 35 *insinuanda virtus...hanc ament*: *TLL* VII 1915, 17 ff.

II. 2. VILLA SURRENTINA POLLII FELICIS

Description of villas:

L. Bek, *Antithesis.* In Ed. K. Ascani a.o. *Studia Romana in honorem P. Krarup septuagenarii* (Odense 1976), 154-66.

H. Cancik, *Untersuchungen* 27-8 with notes.

H. Cancik, *Tibur Vopisci.* Boreas 1 (1978), 116-34 (esp. 129-30 and bibliography on 133).

H. Drerup, *Die römische Villa.* Marburger Winckelmann Programm 1959, 1-17.

H. Drerup, *Architektur als Symbol.* Gymnasium 73 (1966), 181-96.

W. Geissler, *Ad descriptionum historiam symbola.* Diss. Leipzig 1916.

A.-M. Guillemin, *Les descriptions de villas de Pline le Jeune.* BAGB 19 (1928), 6-15.

Z. Pavlovskis, *Man in an Artificial Landscape.* (Leiden 1973).

M. Rostovtzeff, *Pompeianische Landschaften und römische Villen.* JDAI 19 (1904), 103-26.

M. Rostovtzeff, *Die hellenistisch-römische Architekturlandschaft.* Röm. Mitt. 26 (1911), 1-186, esp. 72-8.

A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Letters of Pliny: a Historical and Social Commentary* (Oxford 1966), 186-9.

H. Szelest, *Die Originalität der sog. beschreibenden Silven des Statius.* Eos 56 (1966), 186-97.

K. Winnefeld, *Tusci und Laurentum des jüngeren Plinius.* JDAI 6 (1890), 201-17.

Silvae II 2:

R. Argenio, *La villa sorrentina di Pollio Felice.* RSC 18 (1970), 186-95 (virtually a paraphrase).

S. Barthélémy & D. Gourevitch, *Les loisirs des Romains* (Paris 1975), 34-8 (vss. 1-106[1] with French transl. and notes).

H. Cancik, *Eine epikureische Villa.* AU 11 (1968), 62-76.

A. Klotz, *Curae statianae* (Diss. Leipzig 1896). Intr., text and comm. of II 2.

R. G. M. Nisbet, *Felicitas at Surrentum.* JRS 68 (1978), 1-11.

Pollius' villa and its surroundings:

J. H. d'Arms, *Romans on the Bay of Naples* (Cambridge Mass. 1970), esp. 116-67 and 220-2.

J. Beloch, *Campanien.* 1879², 269 ff.

P. Mingazzini & F. Pfister, *Surrentum* (Forma Italiae Regio I vol. 2) 1946, 54-70.

La Parola di Passato 25-27 (1952): 7 papers, 3 miscellanies and a survey of literary and epigraphic sources on the bay of Naples.

I. St. is the first author to compose long poems describing villas: I 3 (the villa of Manlius Vopiscus in Tibur) and this poem, a description of the villa of Pollius Felix in Surrentum. St. describes architecture also in I 5 (the baths of Claudius Etruscus on the *Campus Martis*), III 1 (the reconstruction of a temple near Pollius' villa) and IV 2 (a banquet in the imperial palace). Two long letters by Pliny are similar to these poems: II 17 and V 6, *cf.* IX 7. Both authors are imitated by Sid. *Carm.* 22, *Ep.* II 2; echoes are found in Aus. *Mos.* and Rut. Nam. *Red.*, see Pavlovskis 33-53.

---

[1] Numbered 40-146.

Descriptions of buildings do occur in earlier Latin poetry: Catul. 17, 1-11 and 64, 42-9, Tib. III 3, 13-6, Prop. II 31 and 32, 11-3, III 2, 9, Hor. *Carm.* II 18, 1-28, *Ep.* I 16, 1-16, Verg. *A.* I 446-93, VI 548-58, VII 176 ff., Ov. *Met.* II 1-18, VIII 689-93, XI 592-615, Luc. X 111 ff., VFl. V 410 ff., see Geissler 34, 55-6, Szelest 1966, 186-7. In prose: Sen. *Ep.* 55, 86, *cf.* 51, 11 and 89, 21. Mart. IV 64 and VI 42 also describe the baths of Etruscus.

These differ from the *Silvae* in the first place because they belong to a different literary *genre*; also they are much shorter. Secondly, their outlook is often different: Hor. and esp. Sen. moralize against the waste of riches (*Ep.* 86, 4-14), the unnaturalness of constructions (*Carm.* I 1, 33-7, Sen. *Ep.* 51, 11-2 and 89, 21, *cf.* Sen. *Con.* II 1, 12, V 5 and 53n.), and the damaging influence of the surroundings on the character (Sen. *Ep.* 51 and 55, 8). In addition, though Martial's poems are full of praise, they are 'concise, catalogue-like descriptions' and 'usually lack the feelings of awe and enthusiasm of Statius' (Pavlovskis n. 20)[2].

Essential for St. is his 'genuine joy in man's subjugation of nature' (Pavlovskis 2). Both St. and Plin. are full of optimism and praise for the material wealth of the villas and their owners and give an admiring description of 'Nature to advantage dressed'.

This is connected with the (somewhat diverging) architectural ideals of St., Sen. and Plin.: whereas Sen. is nostalgic and idealizes the cooperation of man and nature, St. rather regards nature as something savage to be tamed. In Plin. nature and art compete as equals[3].

So there exist also some differences between Pliny and Statius. The first is their intention: Pliny wants to give a systematic and exact account of his villas: *omnes angulos tecum circumire* (V 6, 41) and *totam villam oculis tuis subicere* (44), putting *legere* and *visere* on one line (41). Though his descriptions are not exhaustive (he never mentions his wife's rooms or working quarters), the many attempted reconstructions testify to his relative accuracy. On the other hand 'one could not begin to reconstruct the villa of Pollius Felix' (Sherwin-White 187).

St. also differs from Pliny in the parts of the villa which he describes. 'He dilates on costly materials and ornaments rather than the buildings themselves and wanders into personal and mythological digressions' (Sherwin-W. 186-7). This exemplifies also a difference in personal taste between the two authors: Pliny was not much interested in statues and marbles (*Ep.* III 6, 1-4, VIII 20, 10; marble only mentioned in the descriptions of V 6, 38, *cf.* Winnefeld 217).

---

[2] For the difference between St. and Hor. see Hegyi 196-7, for that between St. and Sen.: Cancik 1965, 74.

[3] See below and the interesting remarks in Bek.

A third and minor difference with Pliny lies in the stress put on illusion: the combination of nature and technique as referred to above, the blending of natural beauty and man-made comfort, can also be seen in terms of illusion and reality. Thus Pliny describes as swimming pool with a view on the sea, thereby creating the illusion of bathing in it, without the accompanying discomfort[4] (II 17, 11), a chamber with a painted forest and an artificial fountain (V 6, 22-3), and hedges clipped to resemble fruit trees (35, *cf.* 16, 32, Pavlovskis 31, Bek 162, differently Sherwin-W. on 35). His attitude is summed up in the phrase *in opere urbanissimo subita velut inlati ruris imitatio* (see Grimal 3, 5-7, 14). Pliny lays more weight on this opposition than St. in II 2, but traces can be seen in 31, 47-9, 74, 91, 93 (*cf.* 13, 17-9, 52-7, I 5, 45-6, Pavlovskis 18-9), and more generally in the way St. has populated the landscape here and in I 3 and I 5 with nymphs, satyrs *etc.*[5].

Rather than complain that St. does not take us on a fictional tour of the house (Vollm. p. 263 on I 3, *cf.* p. 345 on II 2, 44; the same criticism is implied by Sherwin-White and others), we should recognize that St. differs from Pliny because he had different aims.

A first point to account for Sts.' comparative vagueness is that Pliny describes his own villas to his correspondents, while St. writes poems to praise the house and its owner, with whom he could hardly *omnes angulos circumire.* But, of course, St. wrote for a larger audience than the owner of the villa alone. Therefore we must conclude that he did not write for a public mainly interested in technical and topographical detail[6]. He wants not to give an exact description of a maritime villa owned by Pollius Felix, but to compose a poem where the person of Pollius and his way of life are framed and expressed by his villa and the surroundings (see Cancik 1968, 64-5 and 75 n. 49 and below).

Sherwin-White's criticism, that St. wanders from his subject, the buildings, should rather be formulated as: 'splendour is fundamental to Sts.' aesthetics; so he describes the precious marbles at length (85-93, *cf.* I 3, 35-6, I 5, 33-41, Cancik 1965, 76 ff., 1968, 67-8, II 1, 36-136n). He aptly connects the man and his house by describing Pollius' art gallery

[4] A similar kind of illusion: 'Ottoline had the biggest of the ponds enlarged into a ...lake round which hedges were planted...an artificial island in the centre. When the hedges grew Gothic arches were cut through, so people swimming ....could look out and see the blossoming trees in the orchard beyond' (S. J. Darrock, *Ottoline. The life of Lady Ottoline Morrell* (New York 1975), 175).

[5] The concept of illusion is perhaps nowhere so strong as in II 3, see *Intr.* there. I agree with Cancik (1965, 20; 1971, 78) that these poems share the theme of man improving on nature, as against Newmyer 125-6 who sees II 3-5 as a group on the strength of II *Praef.* 16-7, see II 3 *Intr.*, *General Intr.* notes 28 and 34.

[6] Nor, as Geissler (53) points out, in order to *posteris philologiae vel archaeologiae studiosis ostendere, quale talium villarum schema esset.*

(63-72, *cf.* I 3, 47-50). The personal element is essential to the poem since *encomium* is as important to Sts.' descriptions as the descriptive element (see Szelest 1966, 191-3, 195, Newmyer 100, 107). This can be seen, for instance, from the fact that praise closes II 2 and II 3. Praise is also strewn through the poem: 22-3, 26-9, 52-9, 60-3, 81-2. The mythology illustrates, among other things, the qualities of house and owner, *cf.* notes on 19-20, 60-1, 100-6, II 1, 88-102'.

This brings us to rhetoric precepts for a *descriptio*, ἔκφρασις, which have often been considered to be Sts.' examples (II 1, 36-136n., Cancik 1968, 64-5 and 1978, 118). These are found in Aphthonius (II 46 *Sp.*, 4th cent. A.D.) and Theon (II 119, 27 *Sp.*, late 1st cent. A.D.). Geissler has shown (after P. Friedländer) that the descriptio/ἔκφρασις has its roots in poetry (10 ff., esp. 14, 22, 24, 27-31, 37-8, 51-6): Quint. *Inst.* II 4, 3 *descriptionibus in quas plerique imitatione poeticae lasciviae ducantur,* Plin. *Ep.* II 5, 5 *nam descriptiones locorum, non historice tantum, sed prope poetice prosequi fas est,* VII 9, 8, Sen. *Con.* VII 1, 27 *illum* (*Cestium declamatorem*) *imitari voluisse Vergilii descriptionem, Suas* III 5.

Descriptions were part of poetry a long time before they became a part of rhetorical teaching in the schools (Geissler *locc. citt.*, 36-8, II 1 *Intr.* under **I**, II 1, 36-136n., Cancik 1965, 34-7, notes 25, 74, 100, 116, *General Intr.* § 4); for descriptions of places, apart from those mentioned above: Hom. *Od.* VII 81 ff., Ap.Rhod. III 215 ff. P. Friedländer (1912, 66-7) ultimately derives Sts.' descriptions from epigrams and Hellenistic historiography, but Geissler sees, more rightly, the epic descriptions as the origin of Sts.' poems (55-6, *cf.* Fr. 31 n. 2). Bright (12-6) makes a plausible case for the Hellenistic epigram and the epyllion (see II 2, 85-93 footnote) as other influences on St. besides the epic.

II. The poem itself has two main points: man improving upon nature, and the almost symbolic connection between owner and surroundings. Man is represented both as a general defeating nature (the military terms in 31, 52-3, 57-58, 75, 109, or as a tamer of wild animals: 53, 56), and as a civilizer improving upon it (*cf.* on 23-9, 32-3, 45, 54-6, 60-2, 109, 118-20). The interpenetration of nature and culture which is linked to this is expressed explicitly in 44-5 and 51-2. In I 3, St. uses a slightly different concept, stressing the natural advantages of the villa's location (15-23); but this is because nature herself has attained a certain artificiality there, thus lessening man's work (Pavlovskis 18). In I 5 the contrast is seen in terms of the use of water by man. Here the site of Pollius' villa gives St. a chance to represent human civilization at the meeting-point of sea, land and mountain (13-6, 22-3, 50-1, 74-5, 98-9, 103-6, *cf.* Cancik 1968, 65), whereas in I 3 the main play is on the interrelation of the river and the villa divided by it (*cf.* Cancik 1978, 124-7).

The theme of a connection between man and his house is, of course, prior to St., and also found in preceding (beginnings of) descriptions of villas: Horace uses in *Ep.* I 16 his Sabine farm to exemplify the *vir bonus* (*cf.* Kiessling-Heinze's Introd. there; The theme of simple country life and man's simplicity in general is, of course, ubiquitous, *cf.* Pavlovskis 1-5). Seneca notes the correspondence between Scipio's simple bathroom and his unaffected character (*Ep.* 86, 4 ff.) and stresses the influence of the surroundings on character in general (*Ep.* 51, 10-1, *cf.* Plato *Leg.* 704 d-e, Cic. *Rep.* II 28, d'Arms 133, Hamon 484. Contrast Sen. *Ep.* 55, 8). The villa is, both in Plin. and in St., the 'elegant setting for the private activities of its owner, who becomes at the same time the producer, actor and audience of his own theatre' (Bek 164). But a symbolic interpretation of Pollius' villa is stressed by St. throughout this poem, much more than by Pliny anywhere: 26 ff., 56 ff., 69 ff., 112 ff., 131-2, 139-41, *cf.* Cancik 1968, 71 ff., Nisbet 1978, 1-2. It is summarized in 29 *domini imitantia mores.* The Epicurean Pollius Felix (113) lives high above mankind, both literally (3) and metaphorically (131), and he has freed both the landscape from its natural bonds and himself from human vicissitudes. Though Vopiscus also was an Epicurean and is praised in terms very similar to those of II 2, the theme is missing in I 3; this is one way in which St. distinguishes his addressees and his poems, *cf.* Cancik 1978, 127-9 with n. 19.

This symbolic function of II 2 is not simply a poetical view of architecture; it is the way Romans thought about their architecture: the most utilitarian constructions are considered as the expression of Roman imperial concepts: Plin. *Nat.* XXXVI 105 f. says that the Cloaca Maxima shows that man subjects nature, like Rome subjects the world, *cf.* Fron. *Aq.* 16. Roman architecture wants to dominate: the *villae suburbanae* were built on steep hills, not in vales. Roman buildings are 'diaphanous' and point to something beyond their mere appearance: Drerup 1966, *cf.* Lämmli 68-9. This is also seen in paintings of villas: '*die Villenlandschaft ist immer zugleich Seelenlandschaft*': Rostovtzeff 1911, 72. Peters (123-4, 184, 191-2) draws attention to the resemblances between the villa landscape (which first appears in the Third Style) and the sacral-idyllic landscape.

The poem can be divided into three major parts: 1-35, 36-106, and 107-146.

The first part is introductory; it explains the visit (1-12), describes Statius' arrival and the buildings on the shore (13-29), and the portico leading up to the villa (30-5), closing with a geographical comparison clothed in mythological terms. Though this is the least coherent of the greater parts, it achieves some unity because Statius here uses something

like the fiction of a tour of the surroundings (*cf.* 13n.). Moreover, it sets the tone for the poem, notably in 21-9; it announces its subject in 1-5 (*villa* 3) and the praise of Pollius and Polla, which is the subject of the last part, in 6-12.

The central and longest part contains the description of the surroundings and outside of the villa 45-62, and of its inside 63-97 (divided into art 63-72, views 72-85, marbles 85-97). Between inside and outside, however, many correspondences are noted and cross-references made (45-7, 57-9, 72-5, 91, 93). This part is introduced by a kind of *prooemium* (36-42), and closes with a mythological scene of comparable length 100-6 (led up to by 98-9), which points back to the end of the first section (35:100). But the verses 44-5 *locine/ingenium an domini mirer prius?* point also to another kind of division of the central part: *loci* 45-52, 72-85; *domini* 52-72, 85-97 (98-9 rather belong to *loci*, but I see them as mainly transitional); as is implied by the uncertainty of the question 44-5, these two aspects are also heavily interrelated. The formulas like *quid referam* 63, *quid revolvam* 72, *quid dicam* 98 (*cf. an mirer* 45) have a function in articulating the whole, but they are not the main means of giving structure to it. As Cancik (1978, 129) says: '*Die syntaktischen Formen der Beschreibung der Villa sind Frage und Ausruf*'; this is more helpful than the label 'rhetorical formula' (*contra* Vollm. on 44, who divides rather loosely into 44-62, 63-72, 73-97, 98-106).

The last part of the poem contains the praise of the two owners, mingled with and punctuated by good wishes (107 *sis*, 121 *vive*, 143 *discite*). Though from one point of view the central part is the most important one by its length, position and subject (*villa*, see also II *Praef.* 13 *villa*), 107 ff. gather up many points from the preceding lines, giving them their real impact by the connection with Pollius' Epicureanism, and make the poem reach its logical and emotional climax in the human presence in the villa.

III. The villa itself was situated on the so-called Punta della Carcarella between the Punta di Sorrento and Capo di Massa, above the Marina di Puolo, a beach which has perhaps retained Pollius' name. The plateau is not very wide and the archeological remains of the villa are scanty (the essentials already in Beloch; most material in Mingazzini & Pfister, *cf.* Fr. 53 n. 4, Cancik 1968, 62, d'Arms 220-1).

IV. Pollius Felix was a native of Pozzuoli (96, 133-7), possibly from a family settled there in 194 B.C. (Beloch 269, Fr., d'Arms *loc. cit.*). At one time in his youth he also received the citizenship of Naples (136, *cf.* IV 8, 6-8, *PIR*). His son-in-law Iulius Menecrates, to whom *Silv.* IV 8 is addressed, was a citizen of Naples (IV *Praef.* 23-4, Fr. 134 n. 5, *PIR* 2 I

430). Pollius donated public buildings to both cities (III 1, 91-3, *cf.* vs. 136 here). St. knew him well: he calls him *Pollius meus* (II *Praef.* 13, II 2, 39, III 5, 103), *amicus* (II *Praef.* 15), *dulcissime* (III *Praef.* 1). He addressed III 1 to Pollius and dedicated the whole book to him. *Cf.* also III *Praef.* 1-8 esp. *frequenter, quotiens* (5), 27-8 *me...non tam in patriam quam ad te secedere*, III 1, 65 *larem Pollii non hospes habebam.* At the time of this poem Pollius and Polla are already getting on in age: a year later they have grandchildren (III 1, 175), 4 years later a host of them (*turba* IV 8, 10). Their advanced age is also the point of vss. 10, 137-8, III 1, 174, *cf.* Nisbet 1978, 3 (for the dates: Fr. XXIII-IV). Pollius used his villa in Surrentum to compose all sorts of poems (112-5 see 113n.), presumably prose (*eloquentia* II *Praef.* 15, *facundia* 9n.) and to live an Epicurean life (113, 121 ff., 150-2, III 1, 66, *cf.* IV 8, 57-8, *cf.* Grimal 422 n. 4, Newmyer 103). He possessed another estate at Posillipo, called Limon (82, *cf.* III 1, 149), which is also epigraphically attested: *ILS* 5798 *Macrinus...hic ambulavit a villa Polli Felicis quae est Epilimones* (= ἐπιλειμωνῆς). Since the inscription dates from 65 A.D., the Pollius meant may be the same as Statius' friend, but possibly his father is referred to (Mommsen 1883, 158, Vollm. on 82, d'Arms 221-2). The source of Pollius' wealth is unknown. I think d'Arms is more justified in calling him an 'economic parasite' (161), than in suggesting a parallel with Trimalchio (125-6)[7].

He was somewhat exceptional in being a native of the region and living permanently in his villa. Most owners of estates on the Campanian coast were senators with busy affairs elsewhere, and permanent residence was generally only for the old and disaffected like Silius Italicus (Mart. X 30, 28-9, d'Arms 121, 159-61). The Bay of Naples had a great attraction for the Romans from Scipio Africanus maior onwards (d'Arms 1-3, *cf.* Sen. *Ep.* 86). Cicero calls it already *crater ille delicatus* (*Att.* II 8, 2) and Strabo says that the coast from Misenum to Athenaeum resembled one single city (V 4, 8). For Seneca *petere Campaniam* has become a byword for luxury (*Dial.* III 2, 13, *cf.* d'Arms VII-VIII, 117-8). The most important factor in this *peregrinatio* to the Campanian coast was its Greek atmosphere: here Greek luxury, leisure and learning could be savoured, and this seems more or less to sum up Pollius' activities (d'Arms 165-7, *cf.* III 5, esp. 93-4; see II 6, 24n., PP 25-7, 344-57).

1-12.: St. gives a reason for his visit to Pollius' villa: he was invited there when returning to Rome from the Augustalia in Naples (for the place of

[7] About the identification of Polla with Lucan's widow Polla Argentaria, recently advocated again by Nisbet (1978, 3 ff.), see II 7 *Intr.* and 150-3n. here.

1-12 within the poem, see *Intr.* under **II**). The first 5 vss. pinpoint the location of the villa, like I 3, 1-2; but they are at once much more allusive, by the mythological clothing, and more direct by the syntactic factuality of *est...villa*. The villa is the centre of the surrounding rocks (*saxa*), sea (*profundi*) and sloping countryside (*ager, colles*). The next 7 vss. give a great deal of information about where St. was, what he did, what time of the year it was; they name and characterize the owners and tell where their invitation reached St.

The Greek surroundings are stressed by proper names (*Sirenum, Dicarchei, Bromio*) and opposed to Roman regions and culture (*Tyrrhenae/ Minervae*; wine from Surrentum/*Falernis*; the athletes going to Greece; *Ambracias*/Sts.' going to Rome: *Appia*). Thus Pollius' Hellenophilia is clearly announced (95-6, *cf.* on 34-5, 36-42, 64-8) in the context of its Greek surroundings.

1-3. Est: St. begins a poem with a form of *esse* 3 times (I 4, here, IV 9), but it is more relevant to put his use here in the tradition of a description like II 3, 1 *stat.*

The tradition of an *ekphrasis* beginning with *est*, which is picked up by *huc* (5), *hic* etc. is mainly epic, starting with Hom.*Il.* XIII 332-4 ἔστι δέ τι σπέος εὐρὺ...ἔνθα, in Latin probably with Enn. *Ann.* 23 (V.) *est locus Hesperiam quam mortales perhibebant*, imitated by *Verg. A.* I 530-III 163.

A few examples from tragedy, comedy and historians are given by Austin on *A.* II 21-4, *cf.* id. on *A.* I *loc. cit.* The *ekphrasis* with *est...huc/hic* seems especially popular with Vergil and Ovid (I give only places which begin with *est* in first position in the vs.): *A.* I 159, II 713-6, V 124-9 (*cf.* VI 893-7), VII 563-8, VIII 597-603, XI 316-20, 522-6. *Met.* I 168-70, 568-74, II 195-8, IV 432-47, VII 563-8 (*cf.* 607), VIII 788-90, IX 334-6, X 644, XI 229, 235-6, 592-616 (*cf.* XIII 924-30), XV 332 ff., *Fast.* II 491, III 264-5, IV 337, VI 9-13, *Ep.* 16, 53-7, *Pont.* III 2, 45, *Ars* III 687-96.

After Ovid it becomes comparably rare; at the same time it is found somewhat more often outside epic: Sen. *Con.* Exc. 7, 6, Grat. 430, Petr. 122 vs. 146 (probably a parody), Sen. *Oed.* 530, *Her. O.* 485-90, Sil. XI 505, Claud. *In Ruf.* I 123-6, II 466, *Rapt. Pros.* II 290, *Carm.* V 466, XXII 424, Sid. *Carm.* 22, 101-5. In St.: *Th.* II 32, III 60-2, *Silv.* V 1, 222-5. Levy on Claud. *In Ruf.* (*loc. cit.*) claims that it does not occur in Lucan. See Norden 1912² pp. 348-9, Fr. 65 n. 8, Szelest 1966 n. 8, G. Williams 640 ff., 651 ff. and esp. Bömer on *Met.* III 28-47, also for other types of *ekphrasis* than *est...huc.* I have found, however, no reference to our vs. anywhere.

Note that the descriptive character of Sts.' short poems is borne out by the fact that no poem in Prop. IV or Ov. *Amores, Tristia, Ex Ponto* **begins** with *est...huc.*

Am. III 1, 1-5: *Stat...silva...hic* is comparable to *Silv.* II 2, and esp. II 3, but that has first position in its book, and a very lofty tone and subject.

notos Sirenum nomine muros: Surrentum. St. is the only one who clearly plays with the (false) etymology *Sirenes-Surrentum* (also III 1, 64), but it was probably a popular one: Pliny puts the two together at *Nat.* III 62 *Surrentum cum promunturio Minervae, Sirenum quondam sede*; and the cult of the Sirens was firmly established in the bay of Naples: Naples was called Parthenope (I 2, 261, II 2, 84, III 1, 93, 152, III 5, 79, since Verg. *G.* IV 564) after one of the Sirens: Suet. *fr.* 203 (Reiff.) *Parthenopen Sirenem sepultam in Campaniae litore, a cuius nomine* Νεάπολις *Parthenope vocitata existimatur* (*cf.* Lycoph. 717-21, Plin. *Nat.* III 62, Sil. XII 33, *Silv.* IV 8, 3, V 3, 105, PP 392-3). St. gives her a part in founding Naples at III 5, 78-80 and IV 4, 51-2, *cf.* Fr. 128 n. 6. On their cult near Surrentum, probably continuing a local worship, see 116, III 1, 64, V 3, 82, Strabo I 22, R. M. Peterson 303, 2*RE* III 308, PP 423-5. Of their temple on the eastern side of the *promunturium* some remains have possibly been found by Mingazzini (49, *cf.* 45-54, 2*RE loc. cit.*). It was later surpassed in importance by that of Athena, who gave the *promunturium Minervae*, now Capo Ateneo, her name (Ov. *Met.* XV 709, Peterson *loc. cit.*, 2*RE* IV 970, *cf.* Strabo V 247). Three small rocks in the sea near Sorrento are called Σειρῆναι by Strabo (I 22, *cf.* Mingazzini 45-6, 49 n. 3, 2*RE* III 308, differently Vollm. and Fr. 65 n. 2).

templis Minervae: Of the temple of Athena no traces have been found. On its exact location, see Mingazzini 51-3, Fr. 65 n. 2, *RE* XV 1782, 1806, 2*RE* IV 970, PP 425-6. According to Strabo it was founded by Ulysses (V 247). Its high location is stressed at III 1, 109, V 3, 165-6 (*cf.* III 2, 23-4), an unknown poet in Sen. *Ep.* 77, 2 *alta procelloso speculatur vertice Pallas* (= *Auct.inc. fr.* 24, p. 359 Baehrens). St. mentions it also at 117, III 1, 138.

The poetic plur. of *templum* in a literal sense occurs since Verg. (*A.* VI 41 and elsewhere, in a metaphorical sense already in Pl. and Enn.): Schink 128-30, often in St., e.g. 23, III 1, 28, 46, 138, 180 (the sing. for the same temple: III 1, 49, 82, 106, 109).

Tyrrhenae: Because it looks down on the Tyrrhenian sea (V 3, 166, *cf.* V 3, 82) or beach (Strabo VI 1, 2 and 4 Τυρρηνικὴ παραλία); similarly III 2, 24 *Tyrrhena Minerva.* The word does not refer to the Etruscan Minerva (Fr. 65 n. 2).

Dicarchei profundi: The bay of Naples, called after its most important city of commerce, Puteoli (*cf.* Mela II 70, Plin. *Nat.* III 82): Plin.

Nat. III 61 *Puteoli colonia, Dicaearchea dicti* (see Fr. 65 n. 3). The Greek word is kept in use by the poets: *RE* V 546, *Onom.* III 139.

St. uses *Dicarcheus* rather than *Dicaearcheus* to avoid a word of five syllables, see *LHSz.* 765-7, Marouzeau 1935, 97 ff. This form may be invented by St., who has it five times (3 times in Sil.), always in the same position in the line, *cf.* Schamberger 251 and 96n. here.

celsa...profundi: Contrasts mountain and sea, as in 48-9, III 1, 13, *cf.* III 1, 136-7 *ingenti... Tyrinthius arce/ despectat fluctus.*

speculatrix: Also in V 3, 166. It is the first of the military terms which characterize the victory of man over nature, see 52-62n. For the military associations of villas, see Sen. *Ep.* 51, 11 *videbatur hoc magis militare, ex edito speculari late longeque subiecta...scies non villas esse sed castra*, Tac. *Ann.* XIV 9, 1, Plin. *Ep.* I 3, 1. Together with *celsa profundi* it announces the views of 72 ff.: *culmina* 73, *eminet* 83. It also foreshadows Pollius himself, who looks down on mankind *celsa mentis ab arce* (131), *cf.* Cancik 1968, 66-7, 71-2 and 30-1n. Minerva's bellicosity may also play a part in Sts.' choice of the word, *cf.* 117 *cristis.*

4-5. Bromio: Used for Bacchus in Latin since Enn. *trag.* 52 (Jocelyn), together with *Bacchus* and *Lyaeus*, like Ov. *Met.* IV 11-7, Petr. 41. It occurs already in Aesch. *Eum.* 24 and is frequent in Latin poets, though it is found only twice in Augustan poetry, Ov. *loc. cit.* (see Bömer there) and *Copa* 20, see *TLL* II 2204, 4 ff., Fr. 73 n. 3. For the significance of Bacchus in this poem (*Lyaeo* 35, *Baccheo...Lyaeo* 99-100), see 34-5n.

Wine from Surrentum was considered good or very good: Ov. *Met.* XV 710, Col. III 2, 10, sometimes equal to Falernian: Strabo V 243, more in Marquardt 451 with notes. That Tiberius and Caligula thought it worthwhile to express their dislike of it, and the way in which they did so (*generosus acetus, nobilis vappa*: Plin. *Nat.* XIV 64) shows that it had a reputation, *cf.* III 5, 102, IV 8, 8-9.

uritur: Kl. compares *coquere* (Verg. *G.* II 522, Mart. II 40, 5) and *percoquere* (I 6, 15, Ov. *Rem.* 83, Sen. Ben. VII 31, 3) for the basking of grapes. But *uri* seems strange at first sight: *urere* is always negative, 'to burn down, scorch' (see Forc. IV 877, *col.* 1), see Ov. *Rem.* 568 *ne nascens usta sit uva, time, Th.* VII 223-4 *sole male tristique...rosaria usta Noto, cf.* I 5, 46, IV 4, 13. I think that St. puns on *urere/uri*, 'to vex/ to be vexed by envy': *Th.* XI 396 ff. *uritur...corde* and Venini there: '*per invidia*', referring to XI 264, Verg. *A.* I 662, Ov. *Met.* II 809, Forc. IV 877, *col.* 1 under 7. Thus the grape *uritur* without being envious (*non invidet*).

prelis...Falernis: Imitates Hor. *Carm.* II 6, 18 *amicus Aulon...Baccho minimum Falernis invidet uvis.* For *uvis* St. substitutes *prelis*, see Prop. IV 6, 73 *prelis...Falernis*, Sil. VII 165.

On the proverbial excellence of Falernian, see Marquardt 450, Otto 1890, no. 839.

6-9. patrii quinquennia lustri...ad Ambracias...frondes: This is an indication for the time when II 2 was composed: *patrii quinquennia lustri* 'the quinquennial festival (*quinquennia*: *OLD* 3, *cf.* *Ciris* 24 *tarda...confecto redeunt quinquennia lustro*) celebrated at the (quinquennial) feast of my home'. This refers to the *Augustalia* in Naples, games held every 4 years, instituted by Augustus in 2 B.C. (bibliography in PP 406, d'Arms 150-1); they were probably first celebrated in 2 A.D., *cf.* Rostagni 1952, 344 n. 1). They consisted of contests in athletics and in Greek poetry and eloquence and were ἰσολύμπια: Strabo V 246, *Pap.Lond.* 1178 l. 46 (in PP 406). Their official name was Ἰταλικὰ Ῥωμαῖα Σέβαστα Ἰσολυμπικά.

Both St. and his father won victories in it (V 3, 133 ff., where a victory is not expressly mentioned, for his father; V 3, 225-7 for St.). They were held in the beginning of August, (or perhaps the end of July), for Augustus assisted at them shortly before his death on the 19th: Suet. *Aug.* 98, 5.

In III 1 St. describes how Pollius, Polla, St. and others had a picnic on Trivia's feast, *viz.* August the 13th (III 1, 55-60, *cf.* Vollm. and Fr. there). There the plan was born to reconstruct Pollius' temple of Hercules. It is probable (though not absolutely necessary) that this picnic took place on occasion of the visit St. describes here. In 23-4 the temple of Hercules is mentioned without comment, which is an indication that this poem was written before the memorable excursion. This puts the date of the poem shortly before the 13th of August. The year is 90 A.D.: the *Augustalia* were held in 82, 86, 90, 94 *etc.* II 1 was written in about 90, since the 6th book of Martial, with two poems on the same subject, appeared in 90. Two poems from *Silv.* III can be dated to 92-3 (III 3 and III 4). So, unless St. put II 2 in a book where it does not belong chronologically, this poem refers to the *Augustalia* of 90, see Vollm. 6-7, Fr. XXII-XXIII, 65 n. 4, *General Intr.* § 1.

The Actian games are mentioned in 8: *Ambracias frondes.* St. seems to be the only author to use the metonomy *Ambracius* for *Actiacus*, but *cf.* Ov. *Ep.* 15, 164-6 *Ambracia...terra...Actiacum populi Leucadiumque vocant.* Onom. I 99 *col.* 2 wrongly compares Luc. V 652 with St. Ambracia is a town in the same region as Actium, and the *Ambracius sinus* (Liv. XXXII 14, 7, Mela II 54) is the gulf guarded by Actium.

frons occurs frequently for *corona*: I 5, 13-4, V 1, 92, *Th.* I 555 *etc.*: Lunderstedt 54-5, *OLD* 2 c. *Frons* referring to a garland won in the games: V 3, 144. The plural acc. is the rule in poetry instead of the sing. since Ennius. Vergil has the acc. sing. once (*G.* II 435), St. never: Maas 517n.

These games were founded in 27 B.C. to commemorate Augustus' victory (for the date: Tidman 123-5 who refutes Gagé 37 and *SG* II 147 advocating 28 B.C.). They were held in Nicopolis every 4 years on the 2nd of September; they were also ἰσολύμπια and both athletic and musical: *RE* I 1213-5, Fr. 65 n. 4.

Here the *Actiaca* follow upon the *Augustalia.* At one time the *Augustalia* were moved from August to the 23rd of September (Augustus' birthday): *Pap.Lond.* 1178. So this must have happened after 90 A.D., see Fr. *loc. cit.* (who expresses doubts regarding Sts.' exactness here), PP 345 n. 1, *SG* II 147.

laetum: This has sometimes been interpreted as a reference to Sts.' victory in the *Augustalia* (see above), since Markland, see Vollm. 6 n. 7. But this is impossible, since that victory was reported in Sts.' father's lifetime (V 3, 225-7). Papinius senior died between 79 and March 90, when St. reported a victory in the Alban games (Fr. 126 n. 1.). Some scholars put Sts.' victory in the *Augustalia* in 86 (Giri 441-6, Marastoni 1969, 224), mainly to have it as close as possible to his other victory in 90. Others put it much earlier, for instance in 78 (Fr. XVII), because they conclude from V 3, 205-8 that Sts.' father died shortly after 79. If St. was as precocious as his father (V 3, 133), his victory might even be considerably earlier. On the other hand, *laetum* may be explained by Sts.' recent victory in the Alban games, though this seems a very specific interpretation of a general term. On this whole question, see *General Intr.* § 1.

As it is, an indisputable chronology of Sts.' life and its events and the time of his father's death can not be reconstructed from our data. The question is very complex and hotly debated, see *General Intr.* esp. n. 1, n. 4, n. 15, n. 16.

post...quinquennia: For the construction of *post patrii laetum quinquennia,* where *post* belongs to *quinquennia,* see Luc. II 580 *per Scythici profugum divortia.*

patrii quinquennia lustri: A similar ending: IV 2, 62, V 3, 253, *cf.* III 5, 92, V 3, 113, Mart. IV 45, 3, *Anth.Lat.* 1248, 3. *Patrii* may be another reason why St. is *laetus*: St. is in his home-town. This identifies him with Pollius, see *gentile* in 9, 83-5, 97, 136, III *Praef.* 27-8, III 5, 102-3.

cum stadio iam pigra quies: *Quies* (*esset*) as *Th.* II 686, *Ach.* I 141, *cf.* Brinkgreve there, 68-72n. II 6, 97n., II 7, 31-2n.

pigra quies: I 6, 91, II 3, 66, *Ach.* I 438. Markl. conjectured *parta* because *pigra quies* is '*in malam fere partem*', but there is no reason why it should not be meant here *in malam partem*: *quies* is an unnatural state for a stadium. This rest is also stressed by *sederet,* 'to remain motionless' (*OLD*

8), *cf.* e.g. Mela III 77 *Euphrates...sedentibus aquis piger*, Sen. *Her. F.* 704 *pigro sedet nox...mundo*, Luc. VI 649 *aer sedit iners.*

canus: White, '*blanchâtre*': André 1949, 68, *cf.* Ov. *Ib.* 388 *canas pulvere...aquas*, Sil. XV 740, Claud. *Rapt. Pros.* I 187.

conversa gymnade: 'When the athletes had turned away (to the Actian games)'. St. is the first Latin author to use *gymnas.* It is one of the 6 Greek words he introduces into Roman literature: Schamberger 237-8, 245, Speranza 1956, 40. In Greek it means **1.** naked, **2.** trained, **3.** a gymnasium. St. changes the meaning of the Greek, for with him it means **1.** a wrestling match, wrestling: *Th.* IV 106, *Ach.* I 358, *Silv.* III 1, 44, IV 2, 48, the same sense Sid. *Carm.* 2, 497, 5, 162, also in other authors, see *TLL* VI 2378, 50 ff., **2.** metonymically: a wrestler, an athlete: only here[8] and Sid. *Carm.* 9, 189 (with *pale* in 188, another innovation by St.). In *Gloss.* V 600, 64 and V 634, 58 it refers to a female wrestler, see Schamberger and *TLL loc. cit.*

9-12. trans...viarum: 'Eloquent Pollius and charming Polla fetched me from Naples, though I was already longing for the road to Rome'.

St. politely implies that the excellent qualities of his hosts (note the abstracts *facundia* and *gratia* and the adjectives defining other good points: *placidi, nitidae, iuvenilis*) are irresistible: even though he longed for Rome (*cupidum iam*), and though the road is well-known (*noto* 11) and majestic (*regina* 12), he was brought across the sea where he belongs (*gentile fretum*). This is summed up in 13 *sed iuvere morae.*

gentile fretum: The bay of Naples = *imbelle fretum* III 5, 84. For *gentile*: III 3, 60 *gentile solum* = *Th.* IX 298, *Th.* XII 395.

placidi facundia Polli: On *placidus*: II 1, 166-8n. Pollius is called *facundus* also at III 1, 65, *cf.* III *Praef.* 5-6. Other friends of St. are also praised for their *facundia*: Vopiscus (I 3, 1), Gallicus (I 4, 30), Ursus (II 6, 95), Marcellus (IV 4, 45, *cf.* IV *Praef.* 18) and Severus (IV 5, 3).

Facundus and *facundia* can refer to the writing of prose and to (forensic) eloquence but also to composing poetry: *prose-writing* and *eloquence*: II 6, 95 (n.), IV 4, 65 (*cf.* 41-4, 46-9), V 3, 90, perhaps IV 5, 3 (*cf.* 57-60, but the text is uncertain), in jest II 4, 1, *TLL* VI 157, 75 ff., 158, 12, 160, 39 ff. *Poetry*: I 2, 3, II 1, 114 (see 113-9n.), for someone who is mainly a poet: I 3, 1, I 4, 30, *cf.* *TLL* VI 158, 74 ff.

Pollius himself is praised mainly as a poet: 113 ff., see 112n., III 1, 67 (and Schanz-Hosius II 839 n. 5 wrongly classify him as an orator, *cf.* Nisbet 1). But he also wrote or recited prose: *eloquentia* II *Praef.* 14.

---

[8] This meaning is not found in *OLD*, which refers to *Silv.* II 2, 8 under 'an athletic contest'.

Facundia here rather means, I think, 'the literary interests', see *TLL* VI 160, 52 ff.: '*saepe in allocutione amici litterati*', e.g. Mart. IV 23, 5, V 5, 1 *Sexte, Palatinae cultor facunde Minervae, al.*, Fronto p. 19, 7 (*N.*) *a doctissimo et facundissimo Caesare.*

nitidae iuvenilis gratia Pollae: III 1, 87 *nitidae...Pollae.*

Nitidus has overtones both of elegance and style (since Pl.: *OLD* 6), as in II 3, 1 (see II 3, 1-5n., II 7, 81-3n.) and of youthful beauty (*OLD* 3): Liv. XXVIII 35, 7 *in medio virium robore, quod plenius nitidiusque ex morbo velut renovatus flos iuventae faciebat*: (Tib.) III 4, 36, Ov. *Ars* III 74. So here, reinforcing *iuvenilis*, Polla's youthful charm is praised precisely because she is not very young anymore, see *Intr.*, III 1, 161 *si...virides...resumeret annos* (*Polla*), Nisbet 3.

The central meaning of *nitidus*, 'shining, gleaming', attests to Sts.' love of splendour again (see II 1, 36-136n., *OLD*: *nitidus* 1, 2, *nitere*, Ernout-Meillet *s.vv.*). Ovid, with his far greater output, is the only poet to surpass St. in the frequency of *nitere* and cognate words, other poets fall far below: *nitere*: Verg. 7 (+ 1 *Culex* + 1 *Mor.*), Ov. 21 (23), Sen. trag. about 7 (13; 4 from *Her. O.* and *Oct.*, and some very dubious ones), Luc. 4, Sil. 17 (18), VFl. 4, St. 35 (37); *nitescere*: Verg. 1, Ov. 1, Sil. 2, St. 1; *nitidus* Verg. 5 (+ *Culex* 1), Ov. 44 (45), Sen. trag. 13, Luc. 2 (3), Sil. 2, VFl. 4 (5), St. 19; *nitor*: Verg. 0 (*Culex* 3), Ov. 12, Sen. trag. 4, Luc. 0, Sil. 1, VFl. 0, St. 10.

flectere iam cupidum gressus: Vollm., Fr. (65 n. 7) and Traglia-Aricò conclude that St. had already arrived in Capua or Suessula, where the via Appia begins, turning north-west (*cf.* IV 3, 101-2 *flectitur viator...Appia se dolet relinqui*, but *cf.* Håk. 117-8). But there is no need to assume this.

Cupidum can also imply that St. longed for his way to Rome, but had not yet departed. If he still was in Naples both the invitation and *trans fretum* are more plausible.

flectere gressus = *Th.* IV 761, see *vestigia* - :*Th.* IX 485, *gradum* -: Sen. *HerF.* 678, VFl. III 416, *TLL* VI[1] 894, 39-47 and 896, 20-5 (where *iter etc. flectere* and *gressus etc. flectere* stand together).

limite noto Appia...teritur: *Noto* (both 'well known to me' and 'famous') and *teritur* stress the importance of the via Appia: *nobilis Appia* IV 4,2, *ingens* -: V 1, 222, Ov. *Pont.* II 7, 44 *nec magis est curvis Appia trita rotis*, Kleine Pauly I 365.

regina viarum: *Th.* IV 826 *silvarum, Nemea, ...regina, Th.* VI 854 *Alpini ...regina cupressus/verticis.* This use seems inspired by Vergil: *G.* I 482 *fluviorum rex Eridanus*, II 98 *rex ipse Phanaeus* (a promontory). St. seems to like to transfer words for leading persons to things, see *ductor* thus in III 5, 111, *Th.* IV 118 (see *TLL* IV 2170, 21-4 where only 2 other

late instances are mentioned: Hil. *gen.* 79 and Ter. Maur. 1360) and *dux* = foremost II 4, 1: *TLL* IV 2325, 71-3 gives this and Petr. 136, 4 (which is different) as the only examples. Also Verg. *A.* VIII 77 *fluvius regnator aquarum* and Aus. *Epigr.* 28, 1-2 *Illyricus regnator aquis.... Danuvius.* Norden (on *A.* VI 659) suggests a translation from the Greek: Pind. *Pyth.* IV 181 βασιλεὺς ἀνέμων for Boreas, *cf.* Lucil. 1147 (Krenkel) χῖός τε δυνάστης (Chian wine). The use seems virtually to be confined to Verg. and St.

limite: II 1, 175-8n.

13-29. Trip, arrival, buildings on the shore: Here St. uses the fiction of a real trip: *hinc atque hinc* (14), *prima* (17), *hic* (19), *hic* (28), see *inde* (30). After an introductory phrase, a pointed explanation of his reason to accept the invitation (*iuvere morae*), St. concentrates on the small bay of the Marina di Puolo (see below). From its far ends he goes to the centre (15-6) and what he sees there: baths (17-9), with a mythological allusion (*nympha*) developing into a mythologic picture (19-20), and two temples (21-5). He sums up the meaning of it all in 26-9.

The contrast mountain/land is found in 15-6, but the contrast water/land dominates: 14 (*aequora/rupes*), 18-9 (*terris/mari*), 21-3 (*undae... salo/templa... rura*), 25 (*terras/fluctibus*). Note the lexical variation, also *litus*, and *nympha, stagna.*

Especially important are the allusions within the description to Pollius, Polla and their virtues: *placido* (13), *cf.* 9, 140, *gratia* 17, *cf.* 10, *felicia* 23, *cf.* 107, 122 a pun on Pollius' name, *quies* 26 and *clementius* 27, *cf.* 140. The point is explicitly made in 29: the surroundings of the villa mirror the owners, see *Intr.*

Descriptions of a harbour are a feature of epic poetry, introduced by Homer: *Od.* IX 136 ff., X 87 ff., XIII 96 ff. In Latin: Verg. *A.* I, 159-173, Luc. II 613 ff., Sil. XV 220 ff. In some respects St. imitates Verg. (Luc. and Sil. play no part here): *A.* I 159 *secessu/* II 2, 13 *recessu* (both in the beginning), 162 *hinc atque hinc/* = 14, 162 *rupes/* 14 *rupes*, 166 *scopulis pendentibus/* = 16, *cf.* also 164 *aequora tuta silent/* 13 *placido*, 26-9.

There is, however, one great difference: both St. and Vergil knew how to construct a good poetic harbour, but Vergil's is a literary one, which could be real, while Sts.' is a real one described in literature; see, for Vergil's harbour, Austin on *A.* I 159. This is more or less equivalent to noticing that there is a difference in *genre* between the two.

But on another level they have important characteristics in common: in the first place they share the same situation and point of view for their description, the traveller arriving from the sea sees the land as the ship draws near, see Reeker 19, and for a survey of possible occasions for and situations of a literary description: Hamon 473, with special regard to

the novel. Another of those devices is the walk, *cf.* II 2, 30 ff., *A.* VIII 306 ff. Moreover, both work in the same way: the author focuses continually on new, more central and more significant details (esp. *litus, gratia*). Most importantly, the description is also meant to set the tone for the rest of the poem (the action in Verg.) and assumes a (semi-) symbolic value: see above for St. and for Vergil: Reeker 2, 39 ff.

On harbours in Roman painting and their connection with villa landscapes, see Peters 157-8, 187, 192.

13-4.: 'The crescent waters of a tranquil bay break through the curving line of cliff on either hand' (Mozl.). Two different interpretations of the scenery are given by Kl. and Vollm.: The first one thinks that the water '*perrumpunt h.e. interrumpunt*' the rocks which jut forward at each end of the crescent-shaped bay. Vollmer interprets: the sea forms a crescent by the land's peacefully receding; but in some places (*hinc atque hinc*) '*wie die Fahrenden eben auf der Fahrt zu beobachten Gelegenheit haben*' the water breaks through '*die eigentliche, von Felsen gebildete Uferlinie*'. This means, I think, that *perrumpunt* is equal to *in terras irrumpunt.*

Kl. is followed by Mozl.; Fr. probably follows Vollm. The difficulty of Vollmer's interpretation lies in *hinc atque hinc*: this rather means 'on both sides', as in *A.* I 162 *hinc atque hinc vastae rupes minantur.* Moreover, this makes the description of the Marina di Puolo begin with *hinc.* First the water and the rocks are mentioned, then its centre, the beach and the rocky ascent to the villa behind it, *cf.* Kl. on 16. This fits in better with the general brevity of Sts.' remarks on the trip (*trans fretum*) than Vollmer's idea that a trip along the coast from Sorrent to the villa is described. If we take *per* very literally, the rocks at both sides of the bay are broken through by the water, forming an arch or arches at their extremities as often in Italy and Greece; this also seems better than = *irrumpunt*[9].

The meeting of different aspects of the landscape is stressed in the juxtaposition of *aequora, rupes*, continued in *monti...litus, terras scopulis, terris...mari.*

Placido lunata recessu: *Lunatus* = *in modum lunae curvatus* (Lact. Placid. on *Th.* IX 689), e.g. Ov. *Am.* I 1, 23 *lunavit...arcum.* In the *Silv.* only here, also at *Th.* V 145, VI 267, IX 689, XI 532.

Placido...recessu: 'forming a tranquil bay', an ablativus resultativus (*cf.* Waszink on Tert. *An.* pp. 274-5, *LHSz.* 127), which is frequent in Ovid, e.g. *Met.* X 494 *duratur cortice pellis.* Vollm. explains as 'a bay curved because the land peacefully retreats'. But I think that a contrast is im-

---

[9] Vollm. seems to qualify his point of view in his *Addenda* (p. XII). But it does not become very clear what he means.

plied between *placidus* and *perrumpunt.* This rather points to *recessus* = bay: thus the water has two aspects: peaceful within the bay, brutal in the world outside it. Moreover, it is the water of the bay which is linked up with Pollius' character = 26-9 *quies, ponunt furorem, spirant clementius, imitantia.* This would fit with *placidus* in 9.

Lunata is equal to *curvus*, a standing expression for the coast: III 1, 100 *curvi...litoris ora*, Sen. *Ep.* 55, 2 and 89, 21, VFl. III 568, Juv. 14, 86-7.

On *aequora*: II 1, 213n.

15-6. Dat natura locum: Nature supplies a place, *viz.* the beach: *que* in *montique* is explicative. But the *locus* receives its charm only from the human improvements on it: *gratia prima loci* are its baths (17-9), see *Intr.* for this theme.

monti...intervenit unum litus: 'An uninterrupted beach is interposed between the mountain'. For *intervenire* see e.g. Man. IV 419 *sterilis tellus laetis intervenit arvis*, Plin. *Nat.* XVIII 342, *TLL* VII^2 2298, 12 ff.

For *unus* in the sense 'uninterrupted' (not 'one single': Mozl., Fr., Sb., Traglia-Ar., see Klotz 1896), Krohn (in Vollm.) quotes Suet. *Tib.* 40 *uno parvoque litore.* This makes conjectures (e.g. *udum*: Markl. or Scriverius, or *imum*: Gronovius, read by Clouard) superfluous. For a detailed survey of those, see van Dam 388-9.

litus...in terras scopulis pendentibus exit: 'The coast leads over to the land (behind it) by way of overhanging rocks'. Though *in terras* was suspected (*ulterius*: Markl., *interius*: Baehr., *inter aquas*: Grasberger 420), it refers to the direct surroundings of the villa behind the beach: *terrae* 51, *cf.* 98-9; *locum...in terras...loci...e terris* support *in terras* (Fr. *app.*) rather than makes it suspect (Markl.).

exire in: 'to extend, run out': *OLD* 10 a, e.g. *Th.* VI 257-8 *agger campum exire vetat*, Mela II 23 *media (ora) ferme in promunturium exit*, Luc. VIII 461 *scopulos quibus exit in Austrum (Cyprus).*

scopulis pendentibus = Verg. *A.* I 166 (13-29n.), which in its turn reflects Lucr. VI 195 and anon. in Cic. *Tusc.* I 37 (see Austin's note). But it seems improbable that St. had anything else in mind than the verse from Vergil.

17-9.: The first charm of the place is the baths, steaming from their twin cupolas, *cf.* III 1, 101 *clausisti calidas gemina testudine nymphas.* There is also a river (or conduit-pipe: Vollm. *Addenda* p. XII) running into the sea. Though he does not say so explicitly, it is probable that St. means by *gemina*, that Pollius' baths combined the use of fresh and salt water (thus Vollm., Fr. 65 n. 9, Traglia-Ar. n. 17): *CIL* X 1063, found in Pompeii, has *THERMAE M. Crassi Frugi aqua marina et baln(eum) aqua dulci, Ianuarius libertus*, probably from 50 A.D. (for a discussion of the owner:

d'Arms 141-2, 214-6). The text shows that these baths must have been on the Campanian shore near Pompeii. *Occurrit* (19) may also imply that fresh and salt water ran to meet each other in Pollius' baths. Of the baths themselves no remains are extant: Cancik 1968, 62.

Gratia prima loci: Gronovius, followed by Klotz 1896 (but not in his edition), put a colon after *loci*, which I think much clearer than the usual comma (all *edd.*, except Vollm.): the first charming sight (which one meets) are the baths. Vollm. puts a full stop after *loci*. He takes *gratia prima* as referring to everything up to 30, '*mehr...die Naturschönheit...als die künstlichen Anlagen*', wrongly I think, see 15-6n. and Pavlovskis n. 47[10].

For *gratia loci*: Plin. *Ep.* II 17, 1 *gratiam villae, OLD* 6a.

gemina testudine: A *testudo* is a room with a vaulted roof, at least in later Latin and in some earlier technical texts (not, for instance, Verg. *A.* I 605, see Austin there): Non. I p. 81 (*L.*) *testudines sunt loca in aedificiis camerata, ad similitudinem aquatilium testudinum, quae duris tergoribus sunt et incurvis*, see Var. *R.* III 5, 1; 6, 4; 7, 3, Vitr. V 10, 1 *testudines alveolorum*, 'the vaulted bathrooms'. The same connection between vault and bathroom: *CIL* X 5209 (*cu*)*rator...niae aq*(*u*)*as vetu*(*state dilaps*)*as* (*t*)*estudine iu...b et concas*. St. has it also in II 4, 11 (see note there) and III 1, 101. For this meaning of *testudo* and its origin, see Wistrand 12-8.

For *gemina*, see 133-9n.

fumant: I 3, 43-4 *fumant/balnea*, Plin. *Nat.* XXXI 5 *vaporant* (*balnea*), Aus. *Mos.* 337-8 *fumant/balnea* (an imitation of I 3, 43-4, *cf.* Pavlovskis 38-9).

terris: *tectis*: Saenger, *thermis*: Polster 1890, 6, *exerrans*: Havet 177, but see 15-6n. and van Dam 388-9.

dulcis amaro nympha mari: St. plays on the contrast of the fresh water of the river and the salt water of the sea, one of his favourite oppositions, *cf.* esp. *Th.* VIII 362 *Nereides dulci timent excurrere ponto* (for the Nile has swept its waters into the sea). He also likes the myth of Alpheius and Arethusa: I 2, 203-8, I 3, 68-9 *sub fluctibus...dulcis...semita, Th.* I 270-2 with Heuvel's note, IV 239, *cf.* II 3 *Intr.*, Vollm. p. 255, Verg. *Ecl.* 10, 4, *A.* III 694 ff. For *amarus*: *Th.* IX 370, Verg. *Ecl.* 10, 5.

Baths and other forms of water are described fondly and with virtuosity by St.: I 3, 43-6, I 5, II 2, 49-52n., II 3, 1-5n., Cancik 1965, 44, Pavlovskis 16, 38-9, 50-1. In these descriptions he also employs contrasts like hot/cold, bitter/sweet, e.g. I 3, 43-5 (*fumant...algentibus ignem*).

The baths near the sea remind us of those of Pliny: *Ep.* II 17, 11, see *Intr.*, and also of Vopiscus' baths *vicino flumine* (I 3, 46).

---

[10] In his *Addenda* p. 12 Vollm. abandons this idea and suspends his judgment in reaction to a personal letter from Beloch.

nympha: not *lympha* (Barth, Baehr., Phill.): the same personification occurs at I 3, 37, III 1, 101, Mart. VI 43, 2 *canaque sulphureis nympha natatur aquis*, see *TLL* VII[2] 1941, 76 ff. on its origin and etymology, 1942, 17 ff. for confusion between *nympha* and *lympha* in mss. For the fading border-line between nymph and water, dear to St., *cf.* II 3 *Intr.*

19-20. Levis...Phorci chorus...Cymodoce: The baths are such an improvement on 'natural' waters that all kinds of creatures of the sea would like to bathe there. As Pavlovskis points out (16, esp. n. 48), the passages which St. imitates from Vergil, *A.* I 162 ff. (see 13-29n.) and V 822-6 (*Glauci chorus...Phorcique exercitus...Cymodoceque*), are very different in tone: 'the first is concerned with an exceptionally uncivilized region... He (*viz.* St.) suggests that the Nymphs and the sea beasts long for the comforts of civilization which, however, are unavailable to them'. For a case where St. changes a scene from Ovid from gloom to gaiety, see on II 6, 100 ff., *cf.* 21-5n. (*hic...hic*).

Divine beings liking man's work occur also at I 3, 73-80, I 5, 56 *hic velox Hecate velit et deprensa lavari* (in Etruscus' baths), *cf.* I 1, 74 ff., IV 3, 72 ff. (gods satisfied with improvements on their surroundings), I 3, 9-12, I 5, 30-3, III 1, 19-22 (gods helping with constructions), Szelest 1966, 194 and n. 27.

Phorci: Phorcus is an old man of the sea, since Hom. *Od.* V 96, Hes. *Theog.* 237, also Verg. *A.* V 240 *Phorcique chorus*, Luc. IX 646, VFl. III 727, sometimes as Medusa's father: Ov. *Met.* IV 743, 775 (with Bömer), Sil. II 59, see *RE* XX[1] 534-5, Gerhardt, esp. 5-19. Pliny (*Nat.* XXXVI 26) mentions a group by Scopas picturing *i.a.* a *Phorci chorus* in the *circus Flaminius.*

levis: Hor. *Carm.* I 1, 31, Ov. *Ars* I 542, Sil. III 394, *cf.* III 3, 54 *velox chorus.*

udaque crines Cymodoce: According to Vollm. '*udaque crines* übersetzt κυμοδόκη, ihr Haar nimmt eben das Wasser auf'. This seems far-fetched: a pun on the names of nymphs and the like is not made by Vergil (*cf.* Bartelink 172-84) nor is there much analogy between the dripping tresses and the '*aufnehmen*' of water. Her name occurs at Hom. *Il.* XVIII 39, Hes. *Theog.* 252, Verg. *A.* V 826, X 225, *G.* IV 338 (probably spurious), Hyg. *Praef.* p. 28B, see *RE* XI[2] 2478-9.

For etymological puns see 23n. and 36-42n.

viridis Galatea: The most famous of the sea-nymphs, mainly because of the story of how the Cyclops Polyphemus wooed her: Theocr. 2, Ov. *Met.* XIII 750 ff., Sil. XIV 221 ff., Roscher *Lex.* I 1586-9, Bömer on Ov. *Fast.* VI 733.

St. does not allude to this story here; he merely uses the name Galatea[11] to evoke the picture of a Nereid, like Verg. *A.* IX 103.

For *viridis*, see *caerulus* 21, I 5, 15, *Ach.* I 293. It is frequent for divinities of the sea, e.g. Hor. *Carm.* III 28, 10 (first instance), Ov. *Met.* XIII 960: André 1949, 334 (*cf.* 333 *viridis* for the sea itself).

21-5. Ante domum...obstat: 'In front of his house the dark blue ruler of the swollen waters keeps watch, the guardian of that blameless home. The temple is wet with his friendly spray. Alcides protects the happy fields. The haven rejoices in these two deities: one guards the land, the other resists the raging waves'.

How exactly must we picture the situation? There is a statue of Neptune somewhere: *moderator...undae*, see *Ach.* I 61 *rector...profundi*, 78 *rector aquarum*, II 14 *caeruleum regem.* And Hercules (*Alcides*: II 1, 112-3n.) has something to do with it. The main problem is: what is meant with *domus* (21), *lar* (22), *templa* (23)?

Håk (n. 73) explains *domus* as *domus Polli* = *innocuus lar, cf.* II 3, 15-6 *Melioris aperti...sine fraude lares*; so does Traglia-Ar. (792 n. 21) and apparently Mozl., Clouard, Fr., Sb. I think it most improbable that *domus* is the villa: that was situated high on the rocks, it consisted of many buildings (*innumerae domus* III 1, 78-9), and Sts.' focus here is exclusively on the beach; the villa itself only comes into the picture after the ascent by the portico. That *domus* refers to the baths (suggested and rejected by Vollm.) also seems out of the question. This would be a very strange word for them and why should Neptune stand there? Vollm. postulates a small pavilion on the beach ('*ein kleines Landhaus*'). The main objection to that is (as Vollm. himself points out) that it is not mentioned in III 1, 77.

The solution lies, I think, in III 1, 66-88. There a picnic on the shore is described. Suddenly a rainstorm breaks. Though high up above are the *innumerae domus* of the villa, the guests decide *proxima quaerere: stabat dicta sacri tenuis casa nomine templi et magnum Alciden humili lare parva premebat, fluctivagos nautas scrutatoresque profundi vix operire capax* (80-5). There the guests gather, though it is really too small for them: *angusta deficit aedes.* No other building on the shore is mentioned and one wonders why they all came together there if there were more temples or houses on the shore (this argument rests, of course, upon the assumption that St. includes everything in his account, which is not certain).

Then the situation is the following one: there is one small shrine, referred to equally by *domus, lar* and *templa*, with characteristic variation (*cf.* e.g. II 1, 2n., 128-35n., II 2, 49-52n.); similarly: *undae...salo...fluc-*

[11] The Concordance puts Galatea here and in I 4, 76, where it means the region of Galatia, together.

tus...pelagi...aequora...stagna (49-52n.), *rura...portus...terras*. This is the temple of Hercules, close to the shore (*spumant*). A statue of Hercules probably stood somewhere (III 1, 89 ff.), looking inland (23), and he had an altar (*parvae custos...arae* III 1, 9). In front of this temple stood a statue of Neptune, looking seaward. Perhaps sailors and visitors could sacrifice there after safe arrival (as was the custom: *RE* XVI² 2533-4) on the same or another altar.

Innocuus lar then = *humilis lar* in III 1, 83. The new temple is called *domus fraudum...malarum inscia*. *Huius* in 22 then must not be connected with *templa*, 'his temple', for that would make two temples on the shore, but with *salo*, 'his waves'.

On frescoes of villas and their surroundings a small temple is pictured in the foreground more than once, often also a tree (mentioned in III 1, 70): Rostovtzeff 1904, 104 ff., Peters 110, 114-7, 162, 165-6, 174-5, 187-8, 192.

tumidae: pointedly juxtaposed with *moderator* (see *dulcis amaro* in 18). The sea would be *tumidus* and *saevus* (25), full of *furor* (26), if quiet did not reign supreme in this bay, see 26-9 below.

moderator: Cic. *Leg.* II 15 *dominos omnium rerum et moderatores deos*, see *TLL* VIII 1210, 65-80 and 28-9n. (*modesta*).

caerulus and *caeruleus*: for divinities of the sea: *Th.* VII 337, *Ach.* I 650, III 4, 42 (*caerulus*); *Th.* VI 309, IX 400, *Ach.* II 14 (above), III 2, 13 (*caeruleus*), often in Prop. (40 together), see André 1949, 334, 19-20n. above.

spumant...salo: III 2, 74 *nec spumare Thetis...audebat, Th.* I 375 *spumantis scopulos*, II 33, *Ach.* II 36, Verg. *A.* III 534, Luc. VIII 245.

salo: Q¹ (not Domitius, as Vollm. and Fr. claim, nor Politian, as Kl. thinks); *solo*: M.

felicia rura tuetur Alcides: The poetic plur. of *rus* occurs since Catul. 64, 38; it is very frequent. St. employs the nom./acc. sing. once (III 1, 62), the plur. 18 times (in the IInd book also at II 3, 13).

felicia: 'fertile': 107, *OLD* 1b, *cf.* 4-5, 98-9, III 1, 88 *gaudentia rura*. But the word also puns on Pollius Felix' name, like 107, 122, 150.

Puns on proper names are known in Latin literature from Plautus onwards, and St. has many of them, first put together by Nisbet (1978) 8: on *Stella*: I *Praef.*, I 2, 81, 212-3, on *Vopiscus* (someone whose twin had died at birth): I 3, 1-2, on *Melior*: II *Praef.* 1 *Melior, vir optime* and perhaps II 3, 70-1 *optimus*, on *Blaesus*: II 3, 76-7 *tacentem...Blaesi* (a stammerer), on Ursus perhaps II 6, 10 *famulum... Urse*, 14-5 *hominem... hominem Urse*[12],

[12] Not, I think, II 6, 93-4 (n.), quoted by Nisbet, and expressed by Bright (49) as 'the human...has died, but the Bear laments'.

on *Philetus*: II 6, 105 (*Philetus*)...*amari*, on *Celer*: III *Praef.* 13-5, III 2, 125, on *Septimius*: IV 5, 33-4, on *Vindex*: IV 6, 3, on *Sulla*: IV 6, 88, on *Maximus*: IV 7, 9. These may not all be equally convincing, but taken together they certainly show a tendency in St.

tuetur: 'guards', 'protects'; Vollm. wrongly rejects this explanation, but *excubat* and *tuetur* balance each other, like *servat* and *obstat* in 25.

Alcides: Pollius' Hercules has clear Greek traits: Pollius celebrates a private cult for him with his grandson as a priest and yearly Greek athletic games (III 1, 1, 43-7, 143, 147), *cf.* the hymn in III 1, 23 ff.

But more important is a cluster of literary and philosophical concepts about the god: he is the victor over death: III 1, 170-2 *duram scio vincere mortem*, or, in a more abstract sense, the victor over the fear of death, which plays so important a role in Epicurean philosophy: e.g. Sen. *Her.F.* 889-92, *cf.* R. Schilling 53-5, Galinsky 167-9, 180.

Hercules is also the benefactor of mankind: Verg. *A.* VI 801-3, VIII 200 ff., Hor. *Carm.* III 14, 1 ff., Sen. *Ben.* I, 13, 2, *Ep.* 94, 63, *al.*, Galinsky 126 ff., 160 ff. (post-Vergilian epic), 167 ff., *cf.* Lucr. V 22 ff. where Epicurus is said to surpass Hercules by his benefices.

These aspects are also represented in IV 6 *Hercules Epitrapezios*, see Cancik-Lindenmaier 43-65, esp. 44-51 and 64-5 where she ranges IV 6 '*unter die Zeugen...jener griechisch-römischen Mischkultur epikureischer Konfession...die wir Statius verdanken*'.

Pollius Felix was considered an Epicurean. It was, I think, impossible to be interested in Epicurean philosophy without having some of these associations when honouring Hercules, *cf.* (also for the image of Hercules in Latin poetry) Piot 342-58, esp. 350 '*les riches propriétaires des villas...aiment contempler ses exploits, ses victoires les plus symboliques représentées sur leur murs*', see also 34-5n. on Bacchus. And St. lets Hercules address Pollius with *animis opibusque meos imitate labores*: III 1, 166.

For the name *Alcides*: II 1, 112-3n.

gaudet...portus: St. is fond of the personification with *gaudere*: e.g. I 3, 56 *gaudet humus* = II 2, 58, I 4, 86, III 3, 23, 121. The idea of Nature filled with joy is esp. prominent in II 2 and III 1: II 2, 58, 64, 93, III 1, 88, 97 *terra priusquam te gauderet* (an explicit link between Pollius and his land, which 'rejoiced in him'), *cf.* Cancik 1968, 72 and n. 33.

hic...hic: Hercules and Neptune; not local *hic* with *quies* as the subject, as Klotz (1896) wants: after *obstat* a full stop must be put (first by Vollm., followed by the other edd.), after *pelagi* a colon, for *mira quies pelagi* is a short introductory sentence, extended by 26-9. St. imitates Luc. V 442-4 *saeva quies pelagi.../stagna iacentis aquae.../aequora*, turning Lucan's horrible frozen sea into a joyful and smooth one, *cf.* 19-20n.

Håk. (55) thinks that vs. 25 as a whole is spurious, because it is 'a bad and trivial repetition' and contradicts *quies pelagi*, but *saevis* is on one line with *insanus, praeceps, tumidus* and St. contrasts land and sea in just the same way in 50-1.

26-9.: Pollius Felix is an Epicurean (113), like Manlius Vopiscus of I 3 and Septimius Severus of IV 5. On the one hand many men called themselves Epicureans or were considered so throughout the Empire. But we should hold in mind that, though they may well have considered themselves different from professed Stoics or Cynics, eclecticism reigned supreme and distinctions between different schools became blurred, also in the minds of serious students of philosophy. It is most unlikely that anyone in the time of Domitian was concerned to live rigorously by the rules of Epicure himself, or even of Lucretius, *cf.* Ferguson 192-3, Festugière 1954, 62-3 and n. 27, MacMullen 47-9, Vessey 1973, 24-5.

Pollius' retirement is a case in point: to live in a corner is one of the central Epicurean precepts (λάθε βιώσας, *cf.* Usener 551-60); but retirement is so general in the Empire, mainly from political motives, that it is practised and defended also by Stoics (Seneca's *De Otio* for example), rhetors (Quint. *Inst.* III 5, 8 'is a public life recommended' = Cic. *Att.* IX 4, 2) and others. 'In fact, it is a question of temperament': Festugière 1954, n. 27, *cf.* MacMullen 50, 306 n. 6 with references and literature.

St. describes the villa and its surroundings in terms which correspond to Pollius' philosophical interests, see *Intr.* under **II.** This is esp. clear in this section: in 29 *imitantia* it is stated that nature mirrors Pollius' mind, see *quies* below.

26-9 are divided into an introductory sentence (*mira quies pelagi*), followed by a juxtaposition of sea, wind, wind, sea with characteristic lexical variation, punctuated by *hic* (26, 28).

For the whole of 26-9 (and 25) see *AP* IX 144 (Anyte): Κύπριδος οὗτος ὁ χῶρος...ἀμφὶ δὲ πόντος δειμαίνει λιπαρὸν δερκόμενος ξόανον.

26. Mira quies: For *mira*: *mira fides* III 3, 21, IV 4, 81, V 1, 33. Wonder and admiration are very important in the villa-poems: Cancik 1978, 129-30: '*atemloses Staunen...die ergebene Bereitwilligkeit zu rühmen*', see 45 *mirer*, I 3, 14, 20, 37, 57, I 5, 43, 50. On Sts.' attitude to (admiring) surprise: II 1, 113-9n. *stupuere.*

quies is a central concept in II 2: **1)** the opposition between quiet and turmoil is exploited in this poem. **2)** The quiet of his direct surroundings is symbolic for Pollius Felix' mental attitude. The din of nature stands for the turmoil in other men's minds. **3)** Pollius' peaceful life can be regarded both as a general human ideal and as a more specifically philosophic one.

1) Quiet and rest in Nature: in 26-9: *quies, lassa, clementius, modesta* (see *moderator* 21), *iacent/furorem, insani, praeceps, tumultu.* In the rest of the poem: *tumidae undae* 21 = *saevi fluctus* 25; *pelagi clamore fremunt, sonoros fluctus* 50-1 = *maria...obstrepere* 118-9, *rapidi flatus* 118/*silentia* 51, *ponunt, vetantur* 119.

2) In 29 the restrained sea is expressly said to mirror Pollius' character. The other terms used to describe the turmoil of the sea and the wind are also moral concepts: *furor, insani, clementius.* They are not unusual for the sea and wind (*OLD furor* 5, *Silv.* III 2, 71, *OLD insanus* 4a, *insania* 4, *insanire* 3, *Th.* XII 729, Verg. *Ecl.* 9, 43, *OLD clemens* 4a, *clementia* 2, *Th.* III 527, V 468), but they are also appropriate for the passions of the human mind, esp. *Furor* which is denounced by Stoics like Seneca and Lucan, by Lucretius (e.g. III 828, IV 1060), and plays an important part in the Thebaid (Schetter 1-25, Vessey 1973, 259-61, *cf.* Verg. *A.* I 294 with Austin's note). For *insania*, see e.g. Cic. *Tusc.* III 11, Sen. *Dial.* VII 12, 1.

The quiet of Pollius himself is a constant theme: *placidus* 9, 13, 140, *cf.* III 1, 179 (Polla), *compositus* 72, *quies* 71, 140, III *Praef.* 2. On *quies* see also Cancik 1978, 131-2. When Pollius sings, Nature becomes peaceful: 112-20. Pollius is compared to a ship in a safe haven, while the others are thrown about in turbulent waters: 138-41, *cf.* von Albrecht 367 for comparisons with sea and storm symbolizing psychological processes.

So St. employs Nature in a symbolic way for Pollius' character, or, as he himself expresses it, makes Nature itself be influenced by Pollius, just like the villa reveals something about the character and thought of Pollius, see *Intr.*, 131-2n.

3) Withdrawal and detachment are a political reality of the (second half of the) first century, see 26-9n. above. They are also a general philosophical/ethical ideal, see e.g. Sen. *Ep.* 25, *De Otio*, Dio *Logoi* 20. But Pollius' *quies* is also more specifically Epicurean ἀταραξία, untroubledness. Cicero translates ἀταραξία with it in *Fin.* I and II, e.g. I 46, *cf.* Ac. *frgm.* 20 *suavitatem, quietem*, see also Lucr. III 18, V 168, VI 73, and Bailey *Prol.*, IV 13, 258-322n., 1053-75n., Rist 103. The relation with Epicureanism is also implied by the comparison of the quiet and calm sea to the turbulent sea of common life, a favourite comparison of Epicureanism, see 139-41n., and Rist 138.

As pointed out above (26-9n.), this does not mean that Pollius was a rigid follower of Epicure, nor that the ideals St. makes him have are exclusive to Epicureanism. In the first chorus of Sen. *Her.F.* (169 ff.), for instance, almost every word or idea has a parallel in *Silv.* II 2: (the man who leads the wrong kind of life) *illum populi favor* (II 2, 133-4) *attonitum fluctuque* (25, 51) *magis mobile vulgus* (123) *aura* (27, 28) *tumidum* (21) *tollit*

(125, 134) *inani, hic clamosi rabiosa fori iurgia vendens* (124) *improbus iras* (148-9) *et verba locat. Novit paucos secura* (140, 143) *quies* (71, 140).

26-7. lassa: II 1, 15-7n.

28-30. hiems: 'The storm of the soul', ψυχῆς χειμών (Epic. *Men.* 128 = Diog. L. X 128), is another Epicurean metaphor; this adds to the meaning of *hiems* here, see 139-41n.

nullo...tumultu: *Tumultus* is apt both for the sea (*Th.* I 372 *pelagi tumultu*) and for the mind: II 3, 68, Sen. *Ep.* 56, 5 *omnia licet foris resonent, dum intus* (*viz.* in the mind) *nihil tumultus sit.*

stagna modesta: *Stagna*, 'the sea', *Th.* III 250, VI 20, VII 718, Verg. *A.* X 765, see Lunderstedt 17. The poetic plural in this sense occurs since Verg. *A.* I 126, *cf.* VI 323, Tib. I 3, 77, Ov. *Pont.* I 8, 38, *al.* Of 31 times St. has the sing. once, at *Th.* I 359, for the Lernean marsh.

modesta = *moderata*: Cic. *Ac. frgm.* 20 *Academicos...prae illis* (the Stoics) *modestos cautosque homines videri Epicuro, Phil.* V 51, *Tusc.* IV 36, see *Th.* V 680 *cunctante modestior ira.*

According to *TLL* VIII 1226, 42, it is first used for natural objects (with the meaning *tranquillus, lenis*) here, and seldom after St.: Fronto 31, 9 (vdH.), Ti. Claud. Donatus on Verg. *A.* I 45. St. clearly employs *modestus* for the water here to link it with *domini...mores*, see V 1, 118 *moresque modesti.*

domini: Both 'the master of the house' and 'the subjector of Nature', see 56 *domuit possessor* and 52-62n. For *imitantia*, see I 1, 103, III 1, 94.

30-5. The portico: The first part of II 2 ends with the description of the *porticus* leading uphill from the beach to the villa. It is praised also in III 1, 98-100 *Longo tu tramite nudos texisti scopulos fueratque ubi semita tantum nunc tibi distinctis stat porticus alta columnis, ne sorderet iter.*

The description is constructed of 2 + 2 + 2 verses: The first two are mainly factual and stress Pollius' subjugation of Nature (*domat* 31); the next lines rather more stress his role as a civilizer (already hinted at in *urbis opus* 31), using the scheme 'then...now' (below, on *prius*). The closing *Mythologem* (34-5) not only implies hyperbolic praise of the portico, but also alludes to the militantly civilizing character of Bacchus (*Lyaeo* 35), implying a comparison between Pollius and him. The portico leads from the beach, where Nature imitates its master, to the villa where the master has defeated Nature. This passage is an apt conclusion to the Introduction of the poem, closing with a mythological expression similar to the conclusion of the poem's central part (100-5). It also leads over to the central theme of the poem: the villa dominating the landscape and Pollius defeating Nature and improving upon it.

A private colonnade was a symbol of luxury for Roman poets, *cf.* Nisbet-H. on Hor. *Carm.* II 15, 16. Nonetheless many villas possessed one. Cic. in several villas liked it very much (*Q.fr.* II 9, III 1, 1, III 7, IV 7, *cf.* Rostovtzeff 1904, 111 ff. with n. 22) and Horace singles it out for negative comment (*Carm.* II 15, 12-6, *cf.* 51-6n. below). The *porticus*-villa became especially popular along the coast. The colonnade generally faced the sea with its long open side; but, owing to the difficult and therefore provoking terrain, there were many idiosyncratic types of colonnades. This one climbs the rocks at oblique angles (30), others might be curvilinear (d'Arms 127-30, *cf.* Symm. *Ep.* II 60, 2). This is also seen on murals, see Peters fig. 94 (with p. 115-6), 95 (with p. 110-1), 98 (with p. 117-8), 99-102 (p. 114 ff.), 148-50 (p. 157), 158-9 (p. 165-6), 161 (p. 162), 172 and 174 (with p. 174-5). See also d'Arms 130 n. 62. Different kinds of colonnades appear also in Pliny's villas: *Ep.* II 17, 4, V 6, 15, 19, 31.

30-1. Inde...dorso: 'Thence a colonnade climbs zigzag over the cliffs, vast as a city, subjecting with its long ridge the rugged rocks'.

Inde: from the beach.

obliquos: Not, I think, 'steep' (Vollm., quoting IV 4, 60, Clouard), but 'slantwise, zigzag' (Mozl., Fr., Traglia-Ar.), see *OLD* 3a. *TLL* IX² 100, 39 ff. (under '*in transversum*', *Theod.* '*quer*') has some parallels: Liv. XXXVIII 22, 1, VFl. I 484 *per obliqui compendia montis*[13]. For the general meaning 'at an angle with the general direction', *cf.* also Liv. V 16, 5, Ov. *Met.* IX 18 *cursibus obliquis.*

erepit: 'To struggle upwards': '*i.q.* "*eniti*" ': *TLL* V² 749, 20 ff.: it is used both intransitively, as here, and transitively: Hor. *S.* I 5, 79 *montis...quos nunquam erepsemus, nisi nos vicina...villa recepisset.* For *per*, see Sen. *Dial.* X 20, 1, *Ep.* 53, 4 *dum per aspera erepo*, Suet. *Tib.* 60. St. is the first one to use it for something not alive and the only one together with Avien. (*Orb. terr.* 769), see *TLL* V² 749.

arces: 'The rocks', 'peaks': *OLD* 5a, e.g. Verg. *G.* IV 461, VFl. III 565. Krohn's *artes* (in Vollm.), accepted by Klotz 1896, is wrong. St. may use *arx* here instead of a word like *rupes* to create an association with *arx mentis* in 131.

urbis opus: 'A building as vast as a city'. This is what the phrase means in Sts.' predecessors: Verg. *A.* V 119, and Ov. *Fast.* VI 643. St. emulates Ovid here: 639 ff. *ubi Livia nunc est/porticus, immensae tecta fuere domus;/Urbis opus domus fuit.* See also *Th.* VI 86 *montis opus* (Weber, *onus*: Pω): a pyre as big as a mountain, Cic. *Ver.* V 89 (*navis*) *urbis instar.* Plin.

---

[13] *TLL* also quotes Apul. *Met.* IV 6, 3, but there the text is better read differently, see the commentary by Hijmans a.o. (Groningen 1977).

Ep. II 17, 27 and Suet. *Nero* 31 speak of *villae* and *aedificia* which resemble cities, *cf.* Sal. *Cat.* 12, 3 *domos atque villas...in urbium modum exaedificatas.* St. here hyperbolically compares one colonnade to a city.

St. *may* at the same time mean 'a building worthy of a city' (Mar. *Add.* p. 141, Pavlovskis 1973, 13). But this seems improbable: the phrase *urbis opus* was already known in the sense discussed above. And Pollius is a civilizer, but not a city-dweller.

Urbis opus does certainly not mean 'a building worthy of Rome itself' (Klotz 1896 after Barth): for St. and Pollius in this poem *the* city is Naples.

longo...dorso: See *longo tramite* in III 1, 98. *Dorsum* = 'upper part', 'ridge', as *Ach.* I 448 *longo crepidine dorsi*, Verg. *A.* I 110, Col. XI 3, 21 *summam partem, id est in dorso*, Sil. XIII 110 *armato surgebat vinea dorso*; thence the roof of the colonnade is meant, rather than '*gepflasterte Rücken des Weges*' (Vollm., quoting IV 3, 44); in IV 3, 96 *dorsum* is the upper part of the bridge in a rather less technical sense than in 44 (*cf.* Fr. 146 n. 3): see *OLD dorsum* 2a, *TLL* V^1 2040, 16 ff., 75 ff.

domat: 52-62n.

32-3. prius...nunc: This is a favourite scheme in Augustan poetry, almost always about Rome: 'where now the city stands, in earlier times...'. The example is Verg. *A.* VIII 347 ff., Euander shows the site of future Rome to Aeneas. Generally *tunc*(*tum*)...*nunc* distinguishes the two phases: Prop. IV 1, 1-4, 11-5, Tib. II 5, 25-6, Ov. *Fast.* I 243, II 280 with Bömer's note, III 179 ff., V 641 ff., VI 261 ff., 401, Juv. 3, 12-3, see Brandt on Ov. *Ars* III 115-20.

St. employs the scheme here and elsewhere. But he detaches it from the subject of Rome and brings it into a private sphere. Sometimes St. connects it with antiquarianism and aetiology: I 1, 75-6, II 3, 15, IV 6, 89. In this poem also 54-6 *erat...vides...fuerunt...nunc...nunc...fuit, cf.* also III 1, 96-9 *priusquam...fueratque ubi semita tantum, nunc...stat porticus.* In IV 3, 27 *quondam*, 36 *at nunc, cf.* 76 *nunc*, 85 *nunc.* The idea *tunc...nunc* is central in III 1, but the scheme is not employed.

For a different use of the scheme 'then...now': II 4, 8n.

Pollius built the portico when he enlarged the already existent house and reorganised the grounds: III 1, 96 ff.[14].

obscuro permixti pulvere soles...voluptas: The colonnade protects against heat and dust, *cf. Th.* IV 729, VI 870 *sole aut pulvere fessa.* It makes the walk a pleasure (*voluptas*) because it is a work of civilization, instead of *inamoena feritas.*

---

[14] Grimal 313-4, says that the temple of Hercules was restored when the *porticus* was built, but this is refuted by III 1 *loc. cit.*

For the protection which a *porticus* offered: Plin. *Ep.* II 17, 4 (*porticus*) *adversus tempestates receptaculum*, 16-9 *cryptoporticus tam maxime caret sole cum ardentissimus culmini eius insistit*, V 6, 30-1.

obscuro: dark, almost 'darkening': Ov. *Ep.* 18, 122 *latet obscura condita nube dies, cf. Th.* VI 411 *caeco pulvere...latent* (an imitation of Verg. *A.* XII 444), XII 658 *pulvere crasso...lux victa*, 692.

permixti: II 1, 47-8n.

soles: the plural here serves more to express intensity than repetition or duration. Both functions shade off into one another, *cf. LHSz.* 18. A similar plur. occurs also at I 3, 88, III 1, 70, IV 4, 19, IV 5, 6, see Heuvel on *Th.* I 685 and *OLD* under *sol* 4a.

feritas inamoena: A typical expression: uncultivatedness is the opposite of *amoenitas*, almost a technical word for the Campanian villa and its surroundings: Cic. *Att.* IV 8, 1, XIV 13, 1, XVI 3, 4, *Fam.* VII 1, 1, Hor. *Ep.* I 1, 83, I 17, 12, Vell. I 4, 2, Mela II 70, Plin. *Nat.* III 40, Tac. *Ann.* XV 52, 1, IV 67, 3, Juv. 3, 4 and *Silv.* IV 7, 18-9, *cf.* d'Arms 47-8, 132-3. Sen. inevitably remarks (*Ep.* 51, 10) *effeminat animos amoenitas nimia.*

amoenitas, cultivated, or at least lovely, Nature is connected with *voluptas*: Quint. *Decl.* 388 *Litus amoenum non infestos scopulos habet*, Serv. on Verg. *A.* V 734 *amoena sunt loca solius voluptatis plena.*

But when St. states that after the subjugation (*domat*) of savage nature (*feritas, saxa aspera*) the walk is a pleasure, he also alludes, I think, to Epicurean pleasure. This is ἡδονή, *voluptas*, the beginning and the end of the happy life: Epic. *Men.* 128 = Diog. L. X 128, Cic. *Fin.* I 29 *voluptate...quod summum bonum esse volt* (*Epicurus*), Rist 100 ff. St. employs *voluptas* for the fine view from the villa (73), but also for Polla's expression and mind: 150. In other contexts *voluptas* is negative in St. (III 3, 106, *Th.* VII 122). This also suggests that he does use the word here with a special meaning. For a different implication of *voluptas*: II 4, 1n. For inconsistencies in Sts.' views: II 1, 202-5n., II 7, 128-31n.

34-5.: 'The colonnade is like the covered way which leads from the temple of Ino's foster-child Dionysus when you ascend the high top of Corinth, the city of the Bacchiadae'.

Ephyre: (Hom. *Il.* VI 152) was in antiquity thought to be an ancient name for Corinth, after a sea-nymph Ephyre (Paus. II 1, 1, *scholia* Ap. Rhod. IV, 212-14b, Strabo VIII 3, 5, Verg. *G.* IV 343, Plin. *Nat.* IV 11), wrongly, as it is, see Mulder on *Th.* II 207, *RE Suppl.* IV 1009-10. The name occurs frequently in poetry: the noun since Ovid (*Ep.* 12, 27, *Met.* II 240 with Bömer's note), the adjectives *Ephyraeus* (Prop. II 6, 1) and *Ephyreius* (Verg. *G.* II 464) somewhat earlier. In St.: *Th.* II 207, 379,

IV 59, VI 253, 652, VII 105 and here. The genit. *Ephyres* may have, apart from its Greek flavour, metrical commodity: Schubert 52, Mulder on *Th.* II 379.

Baccheis: From Bacchis, ancestor of the Corinthian dynasty of the Bacchiads (see *RE* II 2784, 2792, *RE Suppl.* IV 1013). The word only occurs here: Schamberger 258. It is one of the many Greek adjectives which St. himself derives from proper names (16 in the *Silvae*, see Speranza 1956, 48 and n. 62.; in the IInd book *Euphrataeus* 122 and see 110n.). But Ovid has already *Bacchiadae* (noun) at *Met.* V 407, *cf.* Bömer there and Fr. 66 n. 2. Plin. *Nat.* XXXV 152 and later chroniclers are the only ones to mention the Bacchiadae in Latin.

altum culmen: of Corinth can only mean Akrokorinth, but here the difficulties start: what covered way comparable to Pollius' portico led up to it? M has *Inoo...Lyceo*, R: *Lieo*, Q: *Lechaeo* (probably the source of Domitius to whom it is ascribed until Fr. and Mar.)[15].

What Ino's *Lukeion* could mean is impossible to guess[16]. *Lechaeum* is one of the harbours of Corinth (*cf. Th.* II 380 *Palaemonio...Lechaeo*), from which σκέλη, long walls, run to the city (Xen. *Ages* II 17, Strabo VIII 830, Fr. 66 n. 3). Ino's *Lechaeum* is not impossible, meaning 'the harbour of Ino's city Corinth' (see *Th.* II 380 above), for Ino was honoured as a goddess in Corinth, see *RE* XII 2294, Fr. *loc. cit.* But these walls were not covered, nor did they run up to Akrokorinth; so these cannot be meant either here, *cf.* Klotz 1896, Vollm., Fr. *loc. cit. Lechaeo* is read by Baehr., Phill., Mozl., Clouard.

Lyaeo gives the best sense: 'the sanctuary of Dionysus which (or 'who') is connected with Ino'. *Lyaeus* is a cult-title of Dionysus, 'he who sets free', Λύσιος, from λύω. In Latin since Enn. *scen.* 121 (Joc.), see *OLD* 1, Pease on *A.* IV 58, *RE* XIII 2110. It occurs 14 times in St., in *Silv.* II also vs. 100 here, *cf.* III 5, 102 *cara...iuga Surrentina Lyaeo*, II 2, 4-5n. The word *Lyaeum*, a temple of Dionysus, does not seem to occur elsewhere, (*Onom., OLD, TLG, LSJ*), but *Lyaeus* occurs as an adjective: Verg. *A.* I 686 (with Austin's note), and elsewhere: *OLD* 2b, Pease *loc. cit.*

For the connection of Ino and Dionysus see II 1, 97-8n. (also for the adj. *Inous*), II 1, 178-82n. *Inoum Lyaeum* may not mean more than 'the temple of Ino's foster-child Dionysus'. But it may also imply that Ino and Dionysus shared a temple in Corinth: Ino was worshipped together with Palaemon and Poseidon in Corinth (Paus. II 2, 1, Fr. 66 n. 3). And on the market-place of Corinth stood two wooden images of Dionysus Βάκχειος and Λύσιος (Paus. II 2, 6).

---

[15] Mar. mentions M, R and Q, and prints *Lyaeo*.

[16] Klotz' suggestion (*ed. app.*), that it may refer to a temple of Apollo Lyceus, provokes more questions than it answers.

If this interpretation is right, Dionysus is mentioned here in a mythological complex with a closure-function, in the same way as 100-6, *cf.* II 1, 88-102n. The wine from Sorrent may have been good (4-5n.), but it seems that St. mentions Dionysus also (three times) for another reason: like Hercules (21-5n. *Alcides*), Dionysus is the great civilizer of the world, and so, says St., is Pollius: 56-61.

For Dionysus: Hor. *Carm.* I 12, 25 and II 19 (both with Nisbet-H.), Prop. III 17, 21 ff., Ov. *Fast.* III 715 ff., *Met.* IV 11 ff. with Bömer's note, Sen. *Oed.* 403 ff. Together with Hercules: Cic. *ND* II 62, Verg. *A.* VI 801 ff. with Austin's note, Sen. *Ben.* I 13, 2, IV 8, 1, VII 3, 1, see *Ep.* 94, 63, Cancik-Lindenmaier 47 with Plate 1, Hercules in Dionysiac attire, Bayet 393.

36-106. Villa: For a division of the central part of II 2 according to the schemes 'inside/outside' and 'nature/man', see *Intr.* under **II.**

Note that the villa itself is a kind of transparent wrapping: it is remarkable for the view it offers (45-62, 72-85) and for what it contains (63-72, 85-94), but St. is not interested in giving us any idea whatever of its plan or architecture. Both the view and the treasures within point to the large world without, with great emphasis on Greece: Greek art 63-72, islands with Greek names 76-85, many Greek marbles 85-6, 90-3. Greek Muses are invoked in 36-42 and Pollius is compared to Greek mythical poets at 60-2. This all prepares for the conclusion *Graia probas... Graia frequentas arva* in 95-6. But other parts of the world are also present in the marbles: 86-9. The implication 'from his villa Pollius is lord of the world' (*cf.* II 1, 159-62n.) is continued in 121 ff.

36-42.: The central part of this poem is introduced by a kind of prooemium containing the *topos* 'never could my song match the facts'. The best-known variant of this *topos* is 'Not if I had a hundred (or thousand) tongues...', since Hom. *Il.* II 489 ff., Enn. *Ann.* 561 ff., *cf.* Verg. *A.* VI 625 and Norden, Ov. *Fast.* II 119 ff. and *Met.* VIII 533 with Bömer, *TLL* III 828. In St.: *Th.* XII 797. It was already ridiculed by Persius (5, 1 ff.). The thought 'if only I could praise well enough' occurs also at *Th.* III 102, *Silv.* IV 2, 5 ff., *cf.* Hor. *Carm.* I 6, 12 ff., *rhet. Her.* III 11 *ipsa facta omnium laudatorum eloquentiam anteire*, Men. 95, 2 and 96, 5 *Sp.*, Curtius 93 ff., 413 ff. and more in Nisbet-H. on Hor. *loc. cit.* See also II 6, 48-50n.

The formula *non si* is universal in this *topos*, since it concerns an *adynaton*: IV 2, 7 ff. and, in other connections, I 4, 28 ff., II 1, 10, V 4, 11, Ov. *Met.* VIII 533.

In IV 2 St. feels himself unable *res verbis aequare* (see 52, V 3, 11) even if Homer and Vergil inspired him; here not even the Muses, their foun-

tains and Apollo would be enough. The reason why he chooses these and not the 100 tongues is given by I 4, 25-30: *licet enthea vatis / excludat Piplea sitim nec conscia detur / Pirene: largos potius mihi gurges in haustus / qui rapitur de fonte tuo* (sc. *detur*): St. prefers the poetic inspiration by Rutilius Gallicus to that by the Muses. Pollius is likewise a poet and St. shows by a choice of similar words and by similar etymologizing (see below) that with these formulas he wants to honour Pollius as such. Here, where the villa is in the limelight, St. claims hyperbolically that not even Pollius' inspiration would suffice, although at 112 ff., where Pollius the man is stressed, his poems are praised. Vollmer's idea that St. avoids the *centum ora* after Persius' criticism is less to the point. The *topos* is invariably used within a poem (Pers. *loc. cit.* is a different case), to draw attention to the following; the term '*Binnenproöm*' (Cancik 1968, 64) is perhaps a bit misleading.

Three principles are at work in this catalogue: 1) Allusion to *topoi* concerning poetic inspiration, 2) etymology, 3) geographical variety.

1) St. alludes to poetic inspiration with *Helicon, amnes* and *fontes, Piplea volantis equi* and *Phoebo.*

The connection of *Helicon* with the Muses is fixed since Hesiod's proem of the Theogony; Apollo and the Muses are already combined at Hom. *Il.* I 603-4.

The drinking of sacred water (*amnes, fontes*) is an old symbol for poetic activity (on the fountains of the Muses and their names see below): since Pind. *Isthm.* 6, 74. It is common in Latin (and Greek) poetry, e.g. Lucr. I 926-7 = IV 1-2, Hor. *Carm.* I 26, 6, Prop. II 10, 25-6, III 1, 3, III 1, 6, III 3, 5 ff., 51-2, IV 6, 4, Ov. *Am.* I 15, 25-6, III 9, 25-6, *Pont.* IV 2, 47, Man. II 49-52, Pers. *prol.* 1, Mart. VIII 70, 3-4, XII 11, 2, Juv. 7, 58, Nemes. *Cyneg.* 5. In St.: I 2, 6, 259, I 4, 25-8, II 7, 4, IV 7, 12, V 3, 1-2, 123, V 5, 2, *Th.* IV 60, *Ach.* I 8-9, see Rothstein on Prop. II 10 *loc. cit.*, Nisbet-H. on Hor. *loc. cit.*, Wimmel 222 ff. and 309 ff. on St. (without sympathy or understanding of Sts.' poetry), II 7, 2-4n.

reseret fontes combines the idea of poetic inspiration with that of innovation, being the first in one's field. The same idea is implied in *turbavit*: the fountain was pure and unopened. This concept comes out of Callim. *Ep.* 28, 3-4, *Hymn.* 2 and 10, 110 ff. In Latin it is first touched upon by Enn., elaborated by Lucr. (above), Hor. *Carm.* I 26, 6 *integris, Ep.* I 3, 10-1, *S.* II 4, 94-5, Verg. *G.* II 175, Prop. III 1, 3, In St.: *Ach.* I 8 *fontis...novos.* See Suerbaum 277-9 and n. 792, Wimmel 229-30 and Nisbet-H. *loc. cit.*

Piplea (thus usually in Latin, sometimes *Pimpleia*, from Greek πίμπλεια, see Nisbet-H. on Hor. *Carm.* I 26, 9) is a fountain, a mountain and a place in Pieria. Pieria is also associated with the Muses, since Hes.

Theog. 53, *Erga* 1. The Muses are called *Pipleides* after the fountain: Var. *L.* VII 20 *ab terrestribus locis...cognominatae Libethrides, Pipleides*, Hesychius *s.v.* πίπλειαι, Ps.-Acro and Porphyrio on Hor. *loc. cit.*, *cf.* Catul. 105, 1 *Pipleum montem*, Mart. XI 3, 1, *RE* XX 1387-9, Roscher *Lex.* III 2508-9.

volans equus, the flying horse, is Pegasus, connected with poetry, because he made the fountain Hippokrene (below), see *RE* VIII 1854 ff., XIX 56-62.

2) Etymology: *Piplea* comes from Greek πίμπλημι. This verb is expressed in *sitim superare, sitim sedare. Pudicos...fontes* translates *Casta-lia*/Κασταλία, a fountain in Delphi. It is connected with Apollo and the Muses since Theocr. 8, 148, In Latin e.g. Verg. *G.* III 293, Hor. *Carm.* III 4, 61, see Bömer on Ov. *Met.* III 14, Kambylis 66 ff., 138 ff., 164. *Phemonoe* is Greek φήμην νοέω, to know prophecies, contrasting with *arcana.*

St. handles etymology here in three different ways: in the first instance both the original Greek word (*Piplea*) and the translation (*superet...sitim... sedet*) are expressed. In the same way: Verg. *A.* III 698 *stagnantis...Helori* (ἕλη, swamp), VII 565-6 *Ampsancti...urget utrimque*, see Bartelink 146, 158 ff.

In the second one St. leaves out the Greek. It is 'in fact (a) Latin translation of (a) Greek significant appellative' (Bartelink *loc. cit.*, see Reitzenstein *RE* V 809).

The third one is an etymology based on association: *arcana* and prophecy (φήμη) both belong to the priest(ess, *cf.* V 1, 114), but a strict translation is not intended.

Of these three kinds of etymology the first one, the 'Greek plus translation' is the most frequent: I 2, 49 *Erato iucunda*, I 4, 26 *conscia Peirene* (see Vollm. there), I 6, 36 *Thermodontiacas calere*, II 2, 78 *pelago circumflua Nesis* = III 1, 148 *fixam pelago Nesida*, II 2, 79 *omen felix Euploea* = III 1, 149 *omen Euploea carinis*, II 6, 81 *durum...Acheronta* (n.), III 2, 110 *invida Memphis*, IV 8, 49 *felix Eumelis.*

Etymology where the Greek is not expressed: I 1, 30 *regia* = βασιλική, I 4, 57 *pigrae oblivia vitae* = ληθαργία, II 1, 187 *adusta litora* (n.), II 6, 80-1 *litora...saeva* (n.), III 1, 146 *nudas palaestras* = γυμνάδες, III 4, 24 *auxiliator* = βοηθός, 25 *mitis* = ἤπιος, 100 *mitissime custos* = ἤπιος σώτηρ, V 2, 96 *immemorem amnem* = Λήθην.

The third, allusive type: III 1, 92-3 *iuvenem Parthenopen*, IV 8, 51 *taciti mystae.*

For Sts.' interest in etymology and puns, see II 1, 162-5n., 187-8n., II 2, 18-9n., II 2, 21-5n. (*felicia*), II 3, 9-10n. Vollm. on I 1, 6, Cancik-Lindenmaier 56 with n. 43, Mulder on *Th.* II 49.

Both here and elsewhere (II 2, 78 ff., II 6, 80 ff., III 1, 146 ff., III 4, 25 ff., IV 8, 49 ff.) St. piles up his etymologies. A tendency in this direction can be seen in Vergil, e.g. in the *Periplous* at the end of the 3rd book of the Aeneid (Bartelink 146 ff.), at the end of the sixth book (550, 570, 714, *cf.* Bartelink 179-83). But St. generally has more than one etymology in succeeding lines, while in Vergil much more lines intervene.

3) Geographical variety: Mt. Helicon is in Boeotia, Piplea is in Macedonia near Mt. Olympus, Castalia is in Delphi. Pegasus is usually said to have produced the spring Hippokrene with a stamp. Hippokrene is one of the two sources on Mt. Helicon, see Bömer on Ov. *Met.* V 250 ff., and *Fast.* III 450, *RE* VIII 1853 ff. *Ungula...equi* suggests Hippokrene, in an etymology of the third kind, *cf.* Pers. *prol.* 1 *fonte caballino.* This is maintained by Traglia-Ar. 793 n. 35.

But the variety in geography here is against this interpretation. In II 7, 4 and *Th.* IV 59-61 *Ephyre...qua...amnis Gorgoneo percussus equo,* St. says that a fountain in Corinth was made by Pegasus. This fountain is Pirene, and the location of Pegasus' fountain in Corinth probably goes back upon a Hellenistic model, which, in its turn, developed the story that Pegasus was restrained near Pirene (Pind. *Ol.* 13, 63, Strabo VIII 379, *cf.* Eur. *El.* 475 πειρηναῖος πῶλος, Fr. 86 n. 2). The etymological connection suggests that St. locates Hippokrene in Corinth (thus Vollm. on II 7, 4). But St. may mean that Pirene was made by Pegasus: In I 4, 45 Piplea and Pirene are mentioned together. That Pegasus made Pirene is stated by Dio XXXVI 46, see *scholia* on *Th.* IV 59-61. For Pegasus and other fountains: see *RE* VIII 1853 ff. A similar deviation from the usual location: Prop. III 3, 13 where Phoebus speaks *Castalia ex arbore* to Propertius on Mt. Helicon.

The fountains of the Muses are first mentioned in Lucil. 1008 (M.), possibly in Enn., see Suerbaum *Appendix* 15.

It should be noted that all four sources are put together (*et...que...que*) and contrasted with Pollius' fountains (*vel*), which are thus ranked higher, though even they will not be sufficient. This is prepared by the *gradatio ad minorem* in *indulgeat cunctos...superet...sedet.*

36. cunctos...amnes: There are two fountains on Mt. Helicon: Aganippe and Hippokrene, *cf.* Ov. *Fast.* V 7-8 and Bömer; this expression is hyperbolical, as Mart. VIII 70, 3 *siccare sacram...Permessida,* Aus. *Mos.* 447 *totam...haurire Aganippen.* For *amnes,* see I 2, 259 *sociam doctis haurimus ab amnibus undam.*

indulgere: The construction with a dative and an acc. occurs since Livy, in analogy to *dare*: *LHSz.* 32. It is not unusual in the Imperial Age:

OLD 5. In St. it is found at I 2, 180, IV 6, 36-7, *Th.* IV 691, XI 249. Only with acc.: I 2, 95, *Th.* V 146, VI 233.

superet...sitim...sedet: Alliteration. Gronovius proposed *se det* (approved by Heinsius, written by the *ed. Bipontina*, Baehr. and Klotz 1896). But this destroys the connection and the *gradatio ad minorem*.

38-9. ungula...equi: The synecdoche *ungula* for *equus* is not unusual: II 7, 4 *pendentis...ungulae liquorem* ('the flying horse'), *Th.* VI 401, 459, VII 767, XII 656, *cf.* Enn. *Ann.* 224, Verg. *A.* XII 339, Lunderstedt 20.

But here St. in audacious brachylogy employs *ungula* as a metonymy for *ungulae liquor* (II 7, 4), 'The fountain made by the hoof (or horse)'. He surpasses Ovid's *fontes...Medusaei...signa equi* (*Fast.* V 7-8), *unda... ungula...Gorgonei quam...fecit equi* (*Pont.* IV 8, 79-80).

For Pegasus, fountain and inspiration see also Alc. Avit. *Poem.* 6, 11-4 (*MGGA* VI 2, pp. 275-6) *Non hic fallaci tinguetur barbitus unda/Pegasus unde leves praevertens motibus auras/fingitur adsumpto pendens hinnisse volatu,/dum ferretur equi gravis ungula praepete pinna.*

Phemonoe: Tradition makes her the first Pythia (Paus. X 5, 7, Strabo IX 419, *RE* XIX 1957 ff., *cf.* Fr. 66 n. 3). Both here and at Luc. V 126 she functions as a kind of ideal Pythia, Pythia *par excellence* (*cf.* van Amerongen on Luc.); a similar representation of a/the Pythia: V I, 114. Her connection with Apollo, and esp. that she is considered the inventor of the hexameter (Plin. *Nat.* X 7, X 21, *cf.* 114 here), is the reason for introducing her.

reseret...arcana: Pointed juxtaposition. *Cf.* Verg. *G.* II 175 *sanctos ausus recludere fontes.*

39-40. vel quos...urna: 'Or the sources which my Pollius, under the auspices of Phoebus, by deeper immerging his urn has troubled'.

The mythological expression returns to the personal level with *Pollius* and reaches its climax: not even Pollius' art is adequate to praise his own villa. For a similar personal climax of a *Mythologem*, in the same way leading over aptly to the following description: I 1, 5-7, I 4, 27 ff., where 'personal sources' also appear.

altius: Deeper than St. himself, *cf.* I 4, 36 *tenuiore lyra.* Translators all prefer 'deeply', '*bien profond*'[17].

urna: To draw the water: III 4, 43, Prop. IV 6, 4 *et Cyrenaeas urna ministret aquas.* It is less modest than Ovid's *pocula Castalia plena aqua* (*Am.* I 15, 25-6).

41-2. valeam...aequare: Whenever *valere* has a complement in St. (13 ×)[18] it is the inf.: Fortgens on *Th.* VI 158. In the *Silv.*: I 1, 41, V 1, 28

[17] Clouard translates '*y plongeant une urne entière*'.

[18] The Concordance puts *vale* and *valens* also under *valere.*

and 95. This construction occurs in prose since Livy, in poetry since Lucr.: *LHSz.* 347. It is not found in Catul., Tib. (*LHSz.*), VFl. (Clement).

aequare: to match things with words, to represent something exactly, is an ideal of poet and rhetor: IV 2, 52 *parva loquor necdum aequo tuos...vultus*, V 3, 11 *Martem...aequare canendo, Th.* IV 146, VIII 515, XI 799, Plin. *Ep.* VIII 4, 3, *cf.* Vollm. on I 3 *Vorbemerkung, TLL* I 104, 47-9.

species cultusque: Natural and man-made beauties, as I 6, 29 *insignis specie, decora cultu.* The same turn occurs at III 5, 89. *Cf.* Verg. *G.* I 52 *cultus habitusque locorum*, Ov. *Met.* VII 58 *cultusque artesque locorum*, IV 765 *cultusque genusque locorum.* Here, as in I 3, 15-6, *quae forma* (= *species*) *beatis ante manus artemque* (= *cultus*) *locis*, it is programmatic, *cf.* 44. Perhaps it is no coincidence that St. invariably ends with *cultus*, in the next lines dwelling on the man-made beauties.

42-4. Vix...quae...ne: The introductory vss. close with a statement, an exclamation and a pointed question (see *Intr.*) all expressing the overwhelming impression the villa makes: '*Der Dichter ist überwältigt, fassungslos*' (Cancik 1978, 129). His eyes and feet can not cope with the multitude of things (*turba*): admiration (*mirer*) is everywhere: '*atemloses Staunen...die ergebene Bereitwilligkeit zu rühmen*' (Cancik 1978, 130).

ordine longo: 'Because the number of things succeeding each other is so great', *cf.* Sil. VI 657 (*monumenta*) *quis inerat longus rerum et spectabilis ordo.* It is contrasted with *singula*: whether looking around over the whole or walking past the single sights, they are overwhelming.

oculi: The number of words referring to seeing in the descriptive middle part of II 2 is great: *aspicit* (46, a personification), *vides* (54), *cernis* (55), *cerne* (58), *visendi* (73), *videt* (76, a personification), *spectat* (82), *spectare* (93, a personification).

St. frequently employs the *topos* 'my eyes tire': I 87-8 *vix lumine fesso explores*, I 3, 14 *quam lassas per tot miracula visus*, IV 2, 30-1 *fessis vix culmina prendes visibus*, *cf.* Mart. VIII 2, 4 *optavitque oculos habere plures.* Amazement and admiration are stressed at I 3, 52, III 1, 8 *vix oculis...fides, cf.* I 1, 1-7.

ducor: St. represents himself as being shown round the grounds: *haec* (45), *illa* (46), *haec* (50), *his* (52), *hic vides* (54), *subis, cernis* (55), *hic* (56), *cerne* (58).

This is also the case in 72 ff., where a similar enumeration follows a question/exclamation: *haec, illinc* (76), *hac* (77), *inde* (79), *hic* (85), *hic* (90), *hic* (92).

These terms serve to lend reality to the whole, in spite of the fact that St. does not give a systematic or room-for-room account. His description

is built up in 'lumps', organised according to principles like inside/ outside and splendour, correspondence between villa and owner, see *Intr.*, 36-106n. The simulated confusion of questions and exclamations like 42-5 serves also as a defence of what commentators call a lack of system.

suffecere: The anaphora of the verb at the beginning of the verse is one of the more subtle and rare uses of the device. In the *Silv.* it occurs only three times: I 4, 123-4 */nectite.../nectite,* here and III 4, 1-3 */ite.../ite.../ite.* In I 2, 85-7 one line intervenes */vidi.../vidi.*

A somewhat more frequent phenomenon is the repetition of a word, sometimes a verb, within the line, or at the end of one line and the beginning of the next, see II 1, 38-9n., 68-72n. below.

The anaphora of the verb at the beginning of the line occurs also at Verg. *Ecl.* 4, 24-5, *A.* I 421-2, Ov. *Met.* 551-2, *Aetna* 52-3, 81-2, Sil. XII 147-8. With other classes of words it is less rare, e.g. Verg. *A.* VI 32-3 *bis* (see Austin there), *Ecl.* 10, 42-3, *A.* III 469 *num,* here 65-6.

Anaphora in general gives emotional emphasis, see *Rhet. Her.* IV 13, 19 (*gravitas et acrimonia*), Quint. *Inst.* IX 3, 30 *ab isdem verbis plura acriter et instanter incipiunt,* both about rhetoric, Austin on Verg. *A.* I 78 ff., *LHSz.* 694-6. The combination of this rare anaphora with the repetition of *vix* shows that St. tries to move the audience violently.

For other kinds of repetition: 68-72n. (*ora, cura...curarum*).

gradus: In St. sometimes means 'foot', 'leg': III 3, 85-6 *toto intravit Fortuna gradu, Th.* IV 311 *tremuere gradus,* 663 *succidui...gradus,* IX 325 *levat unda gradus,* 473 ff. *stant...gradus* (followed by *poplite...genibus*), *Ach.* I 339 *gradum...ora manusque feres,* II 147-8 *fluctus, quos...gradu...obstante tulisset.*

Commentators tend to explain *gradus* in such cases as 'a way of walking' or 'a way of standing, stance': Mulder on *Th.* II 586, Venini on *Th.* XI 553-4 *poterant...stare gradus,* see *TLL* V^2 2145, 6 ff.

But this metonymic use for 'foot' seems clear, see also II 3, 11 *hirtos gressus* (n.), Luc. VI 206 *gradibus fessis,* Sil. IV 40 *fessa gradum.* It is not mentioned in *OLD,* nor in *TLL* (V^2 2142, 73 ff., 2145, 6 ff.), which, however, recognizes the use for *gressus:* V^2 2327, 1 ff.

Probably expressions like *gradum vertere* were the starting point for this use, *cf.* also *Th.* II 142-3 *gradum corripuere...toris.*

44-5. Quae rerum turba!: 'What a multitude of things': Ov. *Ep.* 2, 75 *tanta rerum turba*; with *turba* as 'excitement': *rerum turba*: Ov. *Rem.* 461, *Pont.* III 1, 144, IV 5, 27.

Similar exclamations: I 3, 13-6 (*O...quae...quam...quam...quae*), *cf.* 38 ff. *huc oculi huc mente trahor...dicam...? an...?,* III 1, 12 *o velox pietas.*

loci...ingenium: *Cf.* I 3, 15 *ingenium quam mite solo. Ingenium* for natural things is not unusual: Naev. *Lycurg.* 5, Verg. *G.* II 177 *arvorum*

ingeniis, Ov. *Tr.* V 10, 18 *-ioque loci, Pont.* II 1, 52, Sil. IV 91 *collis -ium*, XIV 283 *-io portus*, Rut. Nam. I 328, Claud. *Rapt. Pros.* I 142, see *OLD* 2. In the same way as St., contrasting nature/man, already in Ov. *Met.* III 158-9 *simulaverat artem/ingenio natura suo.*

45-62.: Treat of *ingenium*: *loci* 45-51, *domini* 52-62 (see *Intr.* under **II.**) The whole is built on a series of contrasts: dark-light 45-7, land-sea 48-9, sound-silence 50-1, nature-culture 52-3, mountain-plain 54, animal dwellings-human dwellings 54-5, wood-rocks 55-6. With *domuit possessor* (56) the contrasts are subsumed under the metaphor of the *dominus* conquering nature, led up to by the comparison of the *dominus* to a tamer (*mansuevit* 53). The whole closes with a less aggressive point of view: the *dominus* as a civilizer/poet, in a *Mythologem.*

The contrasts are heavily underlined by forms of *hic*, see on 41-2 *oculi* above.

45-9.: Characteristically most of *ingenium loci* is taken up by a description of light, dark and shadow: 45-7 refer to morning and evening twilight (*ortus, cadentem lucem*) and the way in which the light has faded and yet lingers: 48-49 exemplify Sts.' mastery in describing shadow, especially shadow on the surface of water.

Light and splendour are important to St., and he describes them often and superbly, see II 1, 36-136n., II 2, 9-12n. One of his main objects is shining armour: *Th.* III 225-6, IV 665, V 557, 666, IX 228-9, 802-3, 843-4, XII 732, *Ach.* I 852, 861, other things e.g. I 3, 52-3, *Th.* IX 647.

But what he likes still more is describing border-line situations between light and darkness. It is one of the merits of Cancik to have drawn attention to this predilection of St., see on II 1, 36-136. One of the rare 19th-century defenders of St., A. Biese, already had drawn attention to Sts.' 'power in painting shadow' in 1884, quoted in Pavlovskis 1973, n. 1.

This tendency can be linked with Sts.' general fondness of intermediate situations: for instance the state between boy and girl (II 6, 36-47n.), lingering on the threshold of death (e.g. *Th.* XI 552 ff., esp. 565-6 *vitaeque labantis reliquias*, see II 1, 148-53n., II 5, 16-23n.). In *Th.* XI 55-6 the *tuba* plays on after death. The fusion of air and water: *Th.* V 483 ff. *Longum...polo contexere visa est aequor* (sc. *lux*) *et extremi pressit freta margine caeli*, see Cancik 1965, 50-1, Flores, *General Intr.* § 4 and n. 69.

Concerning light and dark four aspects may be distinguished: **1**) sunrise/sunset, **2**) the contrast of light and dark, **3**) the light lingering on after sunset, **4**) shadow.

1) Sunrise and sunset (*ortus, tenerum iubar/cadentem, exactam lucem*) are the least significant of those, since the description of these phenomena is

part of the epic tradition: e.g. *Th.* I 336 ff., XII 1 ff., 228-9, *Ach.* I 689 ff., II 1-4, *cf.* Mulder on *Th.* II 134, Fortgens on *Th.* VI 25, Bardon 1946, 82-115, esp. 96 n. 2, Pease's extensive note on Verg. *A.* IV 480, II 6, 79-80n. Its main interest here lies in the pointed way in which St. describes sunset (below).

2) The contrast of light and dark: *Th.* XII 658-60 *nec pulvere crasso/armorum lux victa perit, sed in aethere longum/frangitur et mediis ardent in nubibus hastae, Ach.* I 762-3 *nox inlataque fallunt lumina.*

3) The uncertain time of twilight is described here, see *Th.* II 41-2 *est ubi prona dies longos super aequora fines/exigit atque ingens medio natat umbra profundo,* X 390-1 *necdum totas lux solverat umbras/nescio quid visu dubium incertumque moveri,* XII 251, *cf.* Snijder on *Th.* III 33 'the moment of sunrise...is approached from both the dark and the light side'.

4) Shadow is perhaps the most interesting of the four. *Umbra* is both (dark) 'shadow' and (clear) 'reflection', that is to say a representation of a real thing, either by its outline or by its image, which is there to see but not to touch. Both sides are represented here: the shadow of the mountain (48-9) and the reflection of the villa (*natant praetoria*). St. plays with it elsewhere and in II 3, see 1-5n. there.

St. often describes (the effect of) the shadow of a person or animal: *Th.* II 499-500, *Th.* IV 137-8 *umbraque...implet agros* (*sonipes*), V 13-4, 749, VIII 676, X 872, XI 203 (Venini there: '*notevolissimo in Stazio il gusto degli effetti d'ombra*'), XII 732.

More often yet he describes shadow on water, something which is much liked in Latin literature and has roots in Alexandrian poetry, *cf.* Ap. Rhod. I 604, Legras 1905, 255 with n. 1, Cancik 1965, 43 ff. with n. 45. '*Einem Spiegelbild auf dem Wasser ist eigentümlich dass es von der Bewegung des Wassers verzerrt werden kann*' (44). But St. is a past master in it, surpassing, I think, even Ovid, who comes immediately to mind (Echo and Narcissus, *cf.* II 3 *Intr.* and Cancik 1967).

Here reflection and shadow fuse, *cf.* I 3, 17-9 *Nemora alta citatis/incubuere vadis; fallax responsat imago/frondibus et longas eadem fugit umbra per undas,* II 3, 55 ff., *Th.* I 701-2, II 41-2 above, V 51-2, VII 106-7, IX 494, XII 634, *Ach.* I 679. For a similar effect: *Th.* II 531-2 (of a weapon) *umbra cadit campumque trucem lux cuspidis implet,* see Verg. *A.* VII 9, IX 733-4.

45-7.: On the desirable exposure of a house to light and sun in general, see Vitr. VI 4, *cf.* Sen. *Ep.* 55, 6, Plin. *Ep.* II 17, 8 *ambitum solis fenestris omnibus sequitur,* 18, 20, 23.

On sunlight at different times of day, see Plin. *Ep.* II 17, 6 (*cubiculum*) *quod altera fenestra admittit orientem, occidentem altera retinet,* 13 *cubiculum quo sol nascitur et conditur,* 47 *detinet,* V 6, 31 *porticus ante medium diem hiberna, inclinato die aestiva,* Sid. *Carm.* 22, 154-5.

ortus: In the sense 'sunrise' always in the plur. in poetry in nom./acc., except for Verg. *G.* I 441, e.g. Lucr. V 696, Verg. *G.* II 277, *A.* IV 118, Ov. *Met.* V 445 *solis ab occasu solis quaerebat ad ortus*, XIV 386 *ad occasum,...se convertit ad ortus.* In the abl. it is always in the sing. *ortu* (II 6, 79-80n.): Schink 94-5, Maas 487, Bednara 563.

aspicit: Col. VIII 8, 2 *aspiciat...meridiem*, Plin. *Nat.* V 80 *mons... orientem...solem aspicit*, see *Nat.* III 54 (*Tiberis*) *aspicitur...villis*, Plin. *Ep.* V 6, 29, *Silv.* I 3, 40 *ad silvas respicis, aula.* So Markland's *prospicit* is unnecessary.

tenerum Phoebi iubar: 'The radiance of Phoebus when it has just begun': Enn. *Ann.* 557 *iubar Hyperionis*, Sen. *Ag.* 462 *Phoebi iubar*, VFl. V 331.

The metonymy *Phoebus* for the sun (V 1, 17) is popular in Latin, e.g. Hor. *Carm.* III 21, 21, Ov. *Met.* IV 348, Sen. *Oed.* 121, Luc. III 595, Sil. XII 731, see Heuvel on *Th.* I 344, but apparently not in Greek poetry: Grosz 338-41.

cadentem: *Cadere* 'to set': II 7, 26, *Th.* VI 408, Cic. *Arat.* 716, Hor. *Carm.* III 1, 27, Verg. *G.* I 229, *al., OLD* 6. Note the contrast with *umbra...cadit* in 49.

exactam...dimittere: For the oxymoron: II 1, 148-53n.

negat: ς, *vegat*: M. The inf. following *negare* occurs at *Silv.* I 2, 39, I 5, 63, in the *Th.* e.g. at II 234, see Mulder on II 14, Lohr 20, Ov. *Ep.* 3, 40, *Fast.* V 650, Pers. 5, 157, VFl. VII 307, Sil. XVI 548.

48-9. fessa dies: *Fessus* of sunset: Verg. *A.* XI 913-4 *fessos...equos*, Germ. *frgm.* IV 22 (*currus*), Ov. *Met.* IV 633 (*axes*), Sen. *Thy.* 819-20 (*currus*), *Apoc.* 2, 4 (*habenas*). All these words refer to the motif of the chariot of the sun (II 6, 79-80n., II 7, 23-9n.). A mere abstract use occurs only in Man. II 249 (*sidera*), III 60 (*astra*), St. is the only one with *dies* and the personification which it implies: *TLL* VI 612, 16 ff.

On *fessus/lassus*: II 1, 15-7n.[19].

umbra: Translators explain as 'shadow' (Fr., Mozl., Sb., Traglia-Ar.). As said above it also means 'reflection' (this sense is defended by Klotz 1896). The same way of describing (first the mountain throwing its shadow, then the reflected image of things on it): Aus. *Mos.* 189 ff. *glaucus opaco respondet colli fluvius, frondere videntur fluminei latices et palmite consitus amnis*, 194-5 *tota natant...iuga...et...vitreis vindemia turget in undis.*

vitreo: 'Like glass'. Ancient glass was translucent, but that is not the property to which St. alludes. It was also glittering and reflecting. This is

[19] Under *fessus* the Concordance has six instances of *festus* and one line where neither *fessus* nor something like it occurs, II 3, 15-6 (II 3, 14-5 is meant).

what Horace's *fons splendidior vitro* (*Carm.* III 13, 1) means (Williams 1968, 673-4, Nisbet-H. on Hor. *Carm.* I 17, 20) and that is what St. wants to depict also here and elsewhere when he employs *vitreus* for water, the glittering effect of rippling water reflecting something: I 3, 73, I 5, 16, II 3, 5, III 2, 16, *Th.* IX 352, *Ach.* I 26, *cf.* Ov. *Met.* XII 791.

In I 3, 85 *vitreae...Circes* he imitates Hor. *Carm.* I 17, 20 *vitream Circen*, an unusual combination, see Nisbet-H. there.

praetoria: Originally the abode of a praetor, either the tent of the general or the residence of the provincial governor. Since the reign of Claudius it denotes any spacious mansion: I 3, 25, II 2, 82, Mart. X 79, 1, Juv. 1, 75, Suet. *Aug.* 72, 2, *Tib.* 39, *Cal.* 37, 2, Vollm. on I 3, 25, *OLD* 3.

49-51. ponto...pelagi...fluctus: Here and elsewhere in II 2 St. employs many different words for 'sea' and water, see 21-5n., 74 ff. *mare... Nerea...pelago...fluctus...ponti.*

In I 3, which describes a villa on the banks of the Anio, and somewhat less in I 5 (baths of Etruscus) St. also mentions water frequently in a wealth of terms: I 3: *vada* (18), *undae* (19), *fluvii* (26, 32), *sinus pelagus* (27), *aquae* (30, 74), *fluctus* (32, 68), *profundum* (32), *nymphae* (37), *rivus* (44), *flumen* (39, 67), *amnis* (45, 66), *lacus, gurges, fontes* (65), *fons* (70), *stagna* (73).

In I 5 he employs 6 different words of which *unda* prevails.

This illustrates Cancik's remark (1978, 126-7): '*St. hat die Formen, Farben, Geräusche des Wassers sorgfältig beobachtet*', see also II 1, 2n., 128-35n., II 3, 1-7n.

50-1. pelagi...terrae: The villa shares in two different landscapes. The same is the case in Etruscus' villa I 3, 39-40 *te quae vada fluminis infra/cernis an ad silvas quae respicis, aula, tacentes*, Sen. *Ep.* 86, 8 *ex solio* (the toilet) *agros ac maria prospiciunt*, Plin. *Ep.* II 17, 5 *a fronte...maria prospectat* (sc. *triclinium*); *a tergo...atrium silvas et longinquas respicit montes*, 20-2 *a pedibus mare, a tergo villae, a capite silvae...tot facies locorum, totidem fenestris* (72-5n.) *et distinguit et miscet* (*zotheca*).

For the silence in some parts of the house: I 3, 29-30, 41-2, Plin. *Ep.* II 17, 13, 22, 24, V 6, 21, 23.

Haec...haec tecta: 45-6 *haec...illa.* The villa consisted of many buildings, *cf.* III 1, 78 *innumerae domus.*

clamore fremunt...sonoros...silentia: For the opposition between quiet and turmoil: 26n.

ignorat: This personification (also Luc. IX 525 (the desert) *ignorat frondes*) is one of the many personifications of Nature throughout II 2: 4-5 (n.), 15, 18-9 *nympha* (n.), 24n. *gaudet*, 26n., 30n. *erepit*, 31 *domat*, 46

aspicit, 47 *detinet, negat*, 48 *fessa* (n.), 51 *malunt*, 51-9 (n. below), 75 *servit*, 76 *videt*, 78 *respirat*, 81 *angitur*, 82 *spectat*, 86 *respergit*, 87 *fodere*, 91 *imitatur*, 93 *gaudens*, 94 *salutant, cf.* Geissler 41-3.

The personification of Nature is also a feature of Bucolic poetry. Both there and in the *Silvae* this may be said to identify nature with man. But in Bucolic poetry Nature is central and man is put on a par with her; the *Silvae* focus emphatically on man and adapt Nature to him. See Pavlovskis 2-7 with notes, II 1, 82-6n. *Natura.*

52-62.: In these lines St. **1**) describes man, more especially Pollius, as a civilizer. Bringing civilization is compared to waging war and to taming animals. **2**) This subjection of Nature and its result, the villa, are praised.

1) A series of words imply that civilizing consists of war: *victa, cessit* (*OLD* 10a), *domuit, expugnantem, iugum discere, iussum, recedere* (e.g. Caes. *Gal.* II 30), *cf.* 3 *speculatrix* (n.), 31 *domat*, 49, 80 *praetoria*, 75 *servit*, 109 *servitium*, 125 *domas* (n.).

This metaphor is older than St. and occurs, for instance, also in the Georgics: agriculture is a kind of war: I 99 *exercet...tellurem atque imperat arvis*, 104-5, 125, 155, II 369-70 *tum...dura exerce imperia et ramos compesce fluentes*, see 279 ff. The same comparison also in Hor. *Epod.* 2, 3 and (apparently for the first time in Latin) Cic. *Sen.* 51 *terra quae nunquam recusat imperium.* See Richter on *G.* I 99, Wilkinson 78, 83, 88, Altevogt.

But the metaphor is probably better seen in the light of the Roman concept of architecture: this is an intrusion upon Nature and praised as the symbol of Rome's imperial policy. On this agressive attitude see *Intr.* under **II**, Drerup 1966, Lämmli 1968, 68-9, Cancik 1968, 69, who speaks of '*militantes Kulturbewusstsein*'.

It is much more Roman than in accordance with Epicurus' teachings, who taught that some degree of civilization is necessary to be happy, but praises Nature ὅτι τὰ ἀναγκαῖα ἐποίησεν εὐπόριστα, τὰ δὲ δυσπόριστα οὐκ ἀναγκαῖα (Stob. *Flor.* 17, 23, *CB frg.* 67), *cf.* Lucr. VI 9 ff., C. Bailey p. 62, Pavlovskis 5.

Civilizing is also compared to taming wild animals: *docilis, mansuevit, formantem* (*OLD* 4, e.g. Verg. *G.* III 163-4 *ad...usum...formabis agrestem... vitulos*), *discentia, cf.* 33 *feritas.* See II 5, 1 ff. *mansuescere, dediscere, docte* and notes.

This comparison is not new either, *cf.* Lucr. V 1368-9 *fructus... feros...mansuescere...colendo*, Col. I 4, 5 *in id formetur* (*ager*) *quod maxime praestare possit.* But it is exploited by St. and combined with that of war, as in II 5.

The function of man as a civilizer is made clear in *colenti* and epitomized in the closing mythological comparison of 60-2, see below.

2) St. admires and extols the changes which Pollius brings about in Nature by building his villa. This is made clear especially by the comparison of Pollius to Orpheus and Arion (60-2).

Like Pliny, St. reverses a commonplace of earlier Latin oratory and poetry: extravagance in building, frequently connected with disturbing Nature, is eagerly denounced in Augustan poetry, notably in Lucr., the Georgics and Horace (*S.*, and e.g. *Carm.* II 18, III 1, 33 ff.). The *topos* is treated especially often in the elder Seneca: *Con.* II 1, 10 ff. (after examples of changes brought about in Nature): *quis enim tam pravis oblectare animum imitamentis possit si vera cognoverit...congestis in alto terris* (see line 54) ...*adeo nullis gaudere veris sciunt, sed adversum naturam alieno loco aut terra aut mare mentita aegris oblectamenta sunt.* V 5 *ut domus ad caelum omne conversae brumales aestus habeant, aestiva frigora* (see 45-6n.), *et non suis vicibus intra istorum penates agatur annus, ut sint in summis culminibus mentita nemora* (55). See Sen. *Ep.* 89, 21 *nec contenti solo nisi quod manu feceritis*, 122, 5-10, Petr. 120, 88-9 *expelluntur aquae saxis, mare nascitur arvis et permutata rerum statione rebellent*, Quint. *Decl.* p. 179 ff. (Ritter), esp. 15-6 *Quid est istic admirabilis nisi ruris imitatio*?, an ironic question directly opposed to Pliny's enthusiastic *in opera urbanissimo subita velut inlati ruris imitatio* (*Ep.* V 6, 35, see *Intr.*). See Nisbet-H. on Hor. *Carm.* II 18 *Intr.* with literature.

Against this conservatism St. puts a philosophy of progress. He admires technical skill and the comfort it brings to man. In IV 3 he describes the building of a road in lyric metre, stating that a new age has arrived now that Nature has been subjected (72 ff., 124 ff.), *cf.* I 2, 156 *Nec servat Natura vices* as the highest praise.

St. here attaches a positive value to Pollius' handling of Nature: '*Der homo faber tut es...Arion gleich; er verfügt über die Natur nach seinem eigenen Willen, er erzwingt die Durchführung seiner Wünsche praeter oder sogar contra naturam*' (Lämmli n. 366), see Pavlovskis 1-8, Lämmli 68-75. In this respect he shares the views of Plin. min. and the technical authors (e.g. Vitr. II 1, 1-7), see *Intr.*, Drerup 1966, Cole 6-7.

By Nature's readiness to subject herself (*gaudet*) St. implies that art is superior to Nature, see *Intr.*, 21-5n., 92-3n.

52-3 are a general statement, 54-6 illustrate it, pointedly juxtaposing past and present (32-3n.), with variation (*erat hic/ubi fuerunt/quae nunc, ubi nunc/hic fuit*); 57-8 bring in the owner and Nature's joy in subjecting herself, 58-9 his house. The whole closes with a threefold mythologic comparison.

52-3. His...hic: This is the reading of Fσ, followed by all editors. M has *his...his* (see Mar. *app.*). In that case the first *his* would be dative and the second one abl., so *his...hic* is preferable. For similar mistakes in M: II 1, 76-8n., III 5, 74-6 *hic...hinc* for *hinc...hinc.*

favit...cessit: Similarly in 15 ff. Nature and man both have a part in the beauty of the place.

ignotos: 'Unknown to her', *cf.* II 1, 199 *ignota* 'unknown to Blaesus', V 2, 151 *ignotum Achillem* 'whom Pyrrhus did not know', Prop. I 3, 20 *ignotis cornibus* 'Io's horns which were new to Argus'.

dociles: Bailey (1952, 317) thinks that St. imitates Prop. IV 2, 63 *qui me tam docilis potuisti fundere in usus.* The analogy is not very clear. But if St. imitates Prop. IV 2, 64 in *Silv.* IV 6, 35 (thus Schuster in the Teubner edition of Prop.), this would suggest that St. knew these lines well. If St. imitates IV 2, 63, he characteristically changes *docilis* from acc. to nom., *cf.* II 6, 25n.

54-6. plana: For the plur.: Sen. *Nat.* V 7, 2, Quint. *Inst.* XII 9, 2, Mart. XII 14, 6.

vides: 42-4n. *oculi, ducor.*

lustra: The haunts of wild beasts, '*latibula ferarum vel luporum*': *Schol.Dan.* on Verg. *A.* IV 151, see Pease's note, *OLD* 2. The same opposition is found at III 1, 169 *vertis in usum lustra habitata feris.*

nunc: 32-3n. Note that St. 'not only emphasizes that Nature has been mastered by intelligence and skill, but delights as well in the capricious and playful selectivity which Pollius is free to exercise': Pavlovskis 14.

nec: Equivalent to *ne...quidem* here: thus I 1, 26, 40, I 3, 73, 85, I 4, 85, I 5, 15-6, II 6, 21, III 2, 16, III 3, 59, *Th.* IX 352, *Ach.* I 26, *cf.* H. Müller 14.

The first to use *nec* for *ne...quidem* is Enn. *Scen.* 84 (Joc.)[20], once also in Catul. (56, 73), more frequently in Augustan poetry (Prop. II 29, 26, Hor. *S.* II 3, 262, only once (perhaps) in Verg.: *Ecl.* 3, 102) and afterwards: *LHSz.* 449-50 (which mentions Ov., Luc., Pers., Mart., Juv., but not St.).

nec terra fuit is the climax of the preceding lines: not only has Pollius changed existing things (mountains became plains, haunts of beasts became villas for men), he has created something out of nothing: there was not even land, (now there is land and) woods grow on it.

To surpass everything the woods are *ardua*, high. This adj. is commonplace enough (*Th.* VI 98 *ardua fagus* and Fortgens' note), but gets a special meaning here as a hyperbole.

---

[20] Jocelyn disputes this interpretation of *nec.*

For the whole: Mart. *Sp.* 24, 4-6 *par unda fretis, hic modo terra fuit. Non credis? Specta, dum lassant aequora Martem: parva mora est, dices: 'Hic modo pontus erat'.*

domuit: For 'cultivating': III 1, 167-8 *rigidas rupes infecundaeque pudenda naturae deserta domas, Th.* IV 123, VII 333, Verg. *A.* IX 608, *Aetna* 10, Mart. IV 64, 32-3, *cf.* 30-1n., 52-62n.

formantem rupes expugnantemque: 'Giving a definite shape (*OLD* 16) to the rocks and/by defeating them (*OLD* 1b, c)'. Klotz (1896) explains *formantem* as 'producing' (*OLD* 5a), but this would point back to 54-6, which, I think, are already summarized in 56 by *domuit. Formare* and *expugnare* rather point forward to Pollius' making the rocks adapt and subject themselves to the villa in 58-9.

secuta gaudet humus: 'The soil rejoices in being your follower'. For the joy in Nature: 21-5n., *gaudet portus.* The personification of Nature with *gaudere* (*ibid.*) is esp. frequent in St.: it occurs in Verg. *Ecl.* 6, 29 and 9, 48 *segetes gauderent frugibus, G.* II 179-81 *difficiles primum terrae collesque maligni...gaudent silva,* IV 120. Twice in Catul.: 31, 13 (*Sirmio*), 64, 46 (*domus*): *TLL* VI 1708, 39 ff.

gaudere constructed with pass. part. occurs since Verg. *G.* II 510 *gaudent perfusi sanguine,* e.g. *A.* X 449, [Tib.] III 4, 60, in the *Silvae*: I 3, 56, V 1, 50, see *LHSz.* 364, *TLL* VI 1709, 69 ff., Lohrisch 100-1. On *gaudere* with inf.: II 1, 131-5n.

secuta: both literal and metaphorical: the soil follows Pollius, like the trees and rocks followed the mythical poets: *sequuntur* 62. And it obeys him, follows his wishes, as Pollius follows the philosophers and their precepts: *sequi* 70.

iugum discentia saxa: St. plays on *iugum*: He means 'the rocks learning to bear the yoke'. For similar expressions: *Th.* II 443-4 *pectora vulgi adsuevere iugo,* Hor. *Carm.* II 6, 2 *Cantabrum indoctum iuga ferra nostra,* Tac. *Ann.* XII 50 *iugum accepere.* But *iugum* means also the same as *saxa, rupes, montem,* see esp. III 5, 102 *iuga Surrentina,* II 3, 21, II 7, 45, III 5, 98, *al.*, *OLD* 8.

iugum discere joins the metaphors of war (e.g. Hor. above, *OLD* 2a) and of taming: II 5, 1 ff. n.

intrantesque domos iussumque recedere montem: This is in M. and read by all editors before 1900, Saenger, Postg., Mozl., Clouard, Mar. They explain *intrare* either as *migrare ad hunc locum* (Vollm. after Gronovius) or as an indication that the rocks are excised (after Cruceus and Barth).

The other editors accept Rothstein's (1900, 504) *intrantem.* He claims that *intrare* presupposes a confined space, and is different from *migrare. Intrantem montem* he explains as '(*Statius*) *ludens in montis notione qui in novam domum intrat, scilicet ea parte qua aedificatur; et simul prae illa receditur*'.

In any explanation 59 is epexegetical of *iugum discentia saxa.* In favour of Rothstein's conjecture is that *intrantem...iussum recedere* would be not only semantic opposites, but syntactically on one line. Whether *intrare* refers only to a confined space is dubious (e.g. VFl. II 11 *intrantem aequora,* Sil. VII 586 *aeternas intrarat mente tenebras,* see *OLD* 4, 5), but if Cruceus' explanation is right, this is irrelevant.

Rothstein's comment and Frère's paraphrase of it (67 n. 1) are not very clear. But presumably they mean either that the rocks, 'when trying to enter the house', *i.e.* where they are present, are excised; or that they are part of the inside of the house in some places and excluded in others. In the second case *intrare* is not a very apt word.

I think that *intrantes* can be kept: *iugum discentia* is explained by regarding the same thing from opposite points of view: the house is built into the hillside, or some of its buildings, *intrantes domos* (referring to excavating the rock), and thereby the rocks recede. This is also the explanation of Merrill 91 and Mar. 1959, 447-8, who confers *Th.* X 86-7 *antrum it vacuam in montem.* The best parallel seems to be *Ach.* I 106-8 *domus ardua montem perforat* followed by *pars exhausta manu.* On excavating in building, see also III 1, 113, 123-4, 128. *TLL* IV 1955, 56 (*domus*) remarks '*omitto prosopopoeias poeticas praeter haec paulo audaciora*' naming *Silv.* II 2, 59 and III 1, 79 *insedere domus.*

60-2. Methymnaei vatis...chelys...Thebais...Getici...plectri: Pollius is compared to three mythical poets (because Pollius himself is a poet), who influenced nature as Pollius does.

Methymnaei vatis is Arion: Cic. *Tusc.* II 67 *Arionem Methymnaeum,* Mart. VIII 51, 15, Suidas *s.v.* 'Αρίων: Μεθυμναῖος λυρικός, after his birthplace on Lesbos. This is the only place in St. where he is mentioned. For the story of Arion, who was brought to the shore by a dolphin, charmed by his musical powers: Herod. I 23 ff., Ov. *Fast.* II 79 ff., *RE* II 836-41.

Here he is mentioned because he made the dolphin serve him (Kl., Vollm.). Line 120 points back to this comparison. But also because he had more general lyrical powers: *carmine currentes ille tenebat aquas* (Ov. *Fast.* II 84), he could make the lamb attack the wolf and make dog and hare, lion and deer, hawk and dove be together (86 ff.). In short, he turns the usual order of things around, like Pollius.

chelys... Thebais: refers to Amphion. He was the founder of Thebes, and in antiquity almost a symbol for the musical-philosophical side of man's character: *RE* I 1946, Roscher *Lex.* I 308-16. He built the walls of Thebes by playing the lyre, the stones following him, since Hesiod. *frg.* 60 (Rz.): *RE* I 1944-8.

Thebes and Amphion belong together: III 1, 10 *Tyrio...plectro, Th.* I 10, VIII 232-3 *Tyriam ad chelyn, Ach.* I 12-3. Amphion occurs also in St. at III 1, 115, III 2, 41, *Th.* II 455, IV 357, VII 278, X 787, 874, *cf.* IV 611, VII 456, X 772, XI 649 and for other authors Heuvel on *Th.* I 10. He is mentioned because of his *saxa movere sono testudinis*: Hor. *Ars* 395. His construction of the walls is also mentioned at *Carm.* III 11, 2, Prop. I 9, 10, Ov. *Met.* VI 178, Sen. *Her.F.* 262-3, 915, *Phoen.* 566 ff.: Roscher *Lex.* I 314. Pollius' temple of Hercules is built as quickly as Amphion's walls, says St. in III 1, 16-7 and 115-6.

The adj. *Thebais* does not occur elsewhere according to the lexica. As a noun = Theban women: Ov. *Met.* VI 163, *Tr.* IV 3, 29 (of Thebes in Mysia), perhaps Sen. *Ag.* 316.

Getici...plectri refers to Orpheus, who moved trees and stones (II 7, 36-41n., 41-80n., 98-9n.): *Th.* IV 181, *Getica...lyra*: *Silv.* III 1, 17, II 7, 44.

Geticus is Sts.' favourite word for Thracian: 14 times, *Odrysius* 8, *Bistonius* 5 (*i.a.* II 4, 21), *Thracius* 4, *Edonus* and *Ismarius* 2, *Rhodopeius* and *Strymonius* 1, *cf.* Lunderstedt 27-8.

According to Carter (under *Orpheus*) *Geticus* is not employed elsewhere for Orpheus. Since Vergil he is called *Ismarius, Odrysius, Rhodopeius, Thracius.*

In the *Silvae* Orpheus is mentioned also at II 1, 11, II 7, 40, 44, 59, 99, III 1, 17, III 3, 194, V 1, 24, 203, V 3, 16, 60, 271, V 5, 54.

Orpheus, Amphion and Arion are also found together at Ov. *Ars* III 321-6.

Note how St. makes use of periphrases and abstract concepts (*gloria*) to get in the attributes of the poets: *manus, chelys, plectri.* This makes for lexical and syntactic variation, but also puts the concrete objects before the eyes, simultaneously emphasizing their fame as poets, which must surrender to Pollius (*cedat*).

una: The word is explained as an adverb by Skutsch & Vollmer 1893 and by Vollm., 'together with', 'also', because St. needs more than one poet for his comparison. This may be supported by Ov. *Pont.* IV 16, 278 *et qui Maeoniam Phaeacida vertit et una Pindaricae fidicen tu quoque, Rufe, lyrae.*

The translations, however, all explain *una* as 'unique' (*magistrale*: Fr., 'sole': Mozl., also Sb. and Traglia-Ar.). If this is what St. means (and that would be more consistent with *gloria* and the general laudatory trend of the passage), he is extending the use of *unus* in the sense 'one in particular, one above all others' (*OLD* 8a), see Brink on Hor. *Ars* 32. *Unus* can be replaced in such contexts by *praecipuus*, or rather *praecipue*, e.g. Verg. *A.* III 321 *O felix una ante alias Priameia virgo*, Prop. II 3, 29 *gloria Romanis una es tu nata puellis.* St. may in this respect also be influenced by

Greek: gods, but also emperors, were very often acclaimed with formulas of the type εἷς θεός, e.g. ὁ καλὸς Καῖσαρ, ὁ Ἀπόλλων, ὁ Αὔγουστος, εἷς ὡς Πύθιος addressed to Nero (Dio LXI 20, 5). There are some Latin (inscriptional or similar) parallels for this εἷς in the sense 'unique', 'supreme', notably the formula *unus tu*, see Versnel 1974, 389 with n. 110, 396 ff. esp. n. 138.

It seems preferable, anyhow, to explain *una* as an adjective, 'sole', as Mozl. says.

cedat: In accordance with his custom St. is comparing Pollius favourably with others: II 1, 8-12n. Curtius (171) claims that St. is the first one to make a systematic (and in his opinion mannered) use of this device. This is indeed suggested by the frequency with which he employs the formula *cedite, cedat, cedet*: I 1, 84, I 3, 83, II 4, 9, II 7, 75, III 1, 142, III 4, 40, 84, IV 4, 103, see Lohrisch 92-3, Fr. 34 n. 5. This formula is used once by Verg. (*Ecl.* 8, 68) and Luc. (VII 408), twice by Ov. (*Am.* I 15, 34, *Met.* V 311), not in VFl. and Sil. Prop. introduced it into Latin (II 2, 13, II 34, 65 *cedite Romani scriptores, cedite Grai*). He translated Greek (Hellenistic) εἴξατε, *cf.* Geissler 40.

nemora alta: *nemora ardua* 55. *Nemora* may be metonymic for *arbores* (Fortgens on *Th.* VI 99, Lunderstedt 43). But it may as well mean 'woods' and be hyperbolical.

63-72.: A catalogue of the paintings and statues in Pollius' villa. In Cicero's and Augustus' times collecting and exhibiting art had become a rage with the rich. Verres is a case in point: Cic. *Ver.* 2, 87, 4, 93, 126-7, see *Leg.* III 13, 31, *De Orat.* I 161, Hor. *S.* II 3, 64 *insanit veteres statuas Damasippus emendo, Ep.* II 2, 180-1, *SG* III[10] 39 ff., Marquardt 610 ff.

Under the Flavians collecting reached unknown heights. Some of Sts.' patrons and friends were collectors: Vopiscus (I 3, 47 ff.) and Vindex (IV 6), see also e.g. Sen. *Ep.* 86, 7, 115, 8 *circa tabulas et statuas insanimus*, Mart. IV 39 *Argenti genus omne comparasti/et solus veteres Myronis artes,/solus Praxitelus manum Scopaeque/solus Phidiaci toreuma caeli,/solus Mentoreos habes labores*, VIII 51 (both ironic) and many poems on works of art (e.g. IX 43 and 44), Juv. 8, 102-4, Plin. *Ep.* III 7, 8 (Silius' veneration of art), Vollm. on I 3, 47, Wace 158 ff., Cancik-Lindenmaier 5 n. 28.

Apart from Sts.' descriptions of art in I 3, 47 ff. and IV 6, his interest in it appears in I 1, III 1, 94-6, V 1, 230 ff., *Th.* I 540, II 216 ff., IV 132 ff., VI 269, VII 56 ff., IX 332 ff., *Ach.* I 332-3, *cf.* Vollm. on I 3, 47, Gaymann, Smith 1903, Legras 1905, 264 ff., Duncan (II 1, 178-82n.), Cancik 1965, 78 ff., 99-100, Cancik-Lindenmaier 43.

Klotz (1896) thinks that the statues and paintings were exhibited in the porticoes. Vollm., drawing a parallel with I 3, 47, claims that St. refers

mainly to the baths of the villa[21]. Obviously St. feels no need to specify the place of these works of art. So the reader may imagine they are everywhere in the villa. But if, in reality, they were represented in greater quantity in any room, it would probably be the library. The first public library in Rome, founded by Asinius Pollio, included many portraits of writers: Plin. *Nat.* XXXV 9. The villa of the Pisones in Herculaneum had many bronze and marble busts of kings, philosophers and writers (*duces, vates, sapientes* 69) and the great library in Pergamon was already furnished with all kinds of statues; it is possible that this appealed more to Romans than to Greeks, see Webster 102, 186-8. See Plin. *Nat.* VII 115, Mart. *Praef.* IX *Stertinium...qui imaginem meam ponere in bibliotheca sua voluit.* It seems probable that Pollius had put the statues of his examples in his study for inspiration, *cf.* 112 ff. (and the same may be true of Vopiscus, *cf.* I 3, 47 ff. and 90 ff.).

The catalogue is introduced by one line with a formula. Then five lines follow mentioning artists but not specifying works of art. The portraits and their link with Pollius (69-70) introduce the final praise of him 71-2. The arts are divided into painting (64) and bronze-work (65-8); the bronze-work is represented by three artists (65-7) and one kind of work (68). The unity of Pollius' collection and the connection with himself is suggested by the long uninterrupted sentence. The construction is varied in syntax: *referam...figuras...si quid...(id) quod...aera*; variation of asyndeton (64, 65, 66, 68), *aut* (67), *-que* (68), *quos* (69).

64. Quid referam: II 1, 96n. Especially frequent in Ov., e.g. *Ars* I 255, 282, *Fast.* V 227, *Met.* VII 734.

veteres: Denotes antiquarianism. The age of Pollius' acquisitions gives him more status, *cf.* IV 6, 20 *eboris...vetusti*, 23 *veteres...ductus*, Hor. *S.* II 3, 64 and Mart. IV 39 above, Plin. *Ep.* III 6, 3 *aes ipsum, quantum verus color indicat, vetus et antiquum.*

ceraeque aerisque: II 1, 220-2n. and II 6, 52-3n. for *que...que*, II 1, 191-3 for *cerae* = encaustic painting.

64-7. Apellei...Phidiacae...Myronis...Polycliteo: Four masters of Greek art.

Apelles, the most celebrated painter of antiquity (*fl.* about 330 BC), is the only painter whom St. ever mentions: I 1, 100, IV 6, 29, V 1, 5, Lohrisch 106, Gaymann 15. The technique of encaustic painting was invented before his time (Plin. *Nat.* XXXV 122-3) and his fame rested on other techniques. Though St. mentions *cerae* in connection with him also at I 1, 100, he probably names him because of his general reputa-

[21] I do not agree with Vollm. that I 3, 47 ff. describe only or especially the baths.

tion: Plin. *Nat.* XXXV 79 *picturae plura solus quam ceteri omnes contulit, RE* I 2689-92.

Three 5th-century sculptors are named: Phidias, Myron and Polyclitus. The order is chronological (Austin on Quint. *Inst.* XII 10, 7). Phidias was most famous for his statues of gods (Zeus, Athena): *RE* XIX[2] 1919-35, Myron made impressive bronze-images of animals (cow, dog, cicada, locust): Plin. *Nat.* XXXIV 57, *RE* XVI[1] 1124-30. Polyclitus' men were very famous (the Diadoumenos): Plin. *Nat. ibid.* 55, *RE* XXI[2] 1707-20, esp. Quint. *Inst.* XII 10, 7 with Austin's note.

Vollm. calls the enumeration '*schulgemäss*'. But the material for it could be found in semi-technical accounts (Plin. *Nat.* XXXIV-XXXV, Quint. *Inst.* XII 10), and also in reality, *cf.* Friedländer *SG* III[10] 39 ff., Fr. 158 n. 3. The sculptors mentioned are also enumerated elsewhere: Myron, Phidias, Mentor: Mart. IV 39, Myron, Mentor, Polyclitus: VIII 51, Myron, Phidias, Polyclitus, Mentor: Juv. 8, 102-4. But the combinations vary, the order is different (St. ranges them in different order in IV 6, 20 ff. and according to a different principle. Neither order is the same as that of Quint. or Pliny XXXIV 54-7).

It is most improbable that Pollius possessed originals of these masters, but copies were available everywhere: Cancik 1968, 74, Webster 17-8 'a copy of Phidias or Polykleitos was as acceptable or more acceptable than a contemporary work', Wace 30-1 (those in the villa at Herculaneum are copies, both the portraits and the bust of the Polyclitan Doryphorus).

gaudent animasse: Almost equal to *animant.* For *gaudere*: 21-5n., for the inf. following it: II 1, 131-5n.

animare: for art ('to animate') also at I 5, 42, V 1, 2, *Th.* VI 269, see *vivere* below and note. Apelles painted a horse so life-like that real horses whinnied at it: Plin. *Nat.* XXXV 95.

colores: As in 60-1 (n.) St. mentions attributes: *colores, manus* (66), *caelo* (67).

si quid adhuc...Phidicae rasere manus: 'Admirable work carved by Phidias' hands, even when his statue of Zeus did not yet stand in Olympia'.

St. probably refers to miniatures, for he often mentions the idea that artists, like writers, try their hand at small works before they create great ones: I 3, 50-1 (with Vollm.), IV 6, 44, for poetry I *Praef.* 7-10, II 7, 55, IV *Praef.* 31-3, *Ach.* I 19, *cf.* Fr. 33 n. 2.

tamen: with *admirabile*: 'admirable, though not yet his masterpiece'.

si quid: 'whatever', after Greek εἴ τις for ὅστις: *si quis* for *quicunque*, see Kühner-St. II 430 (who has, apart from Pl. *Rud.* 373, only examples from prose, and only examples with protasis and apodosis).

Pisa: metonymically for Olympia; Pisa is the district around it. Also at Sen. *Tro.* 849 *Pisa Iovis*, Mart. VII 56, 4 *Phidiaco...Iovi...Pisa. Pisaeus* for 'Olympian': IV 6, 27 *ebur Pisaeo pollice rasum* (the statue of Zeus). When it occurs referring to the Olympian games (since Verg. *G.* III 180 *Pisa*, Ov. *Tr.* IV 10, 95 *Pisaeus*), it is not really a metonymy, for the games were held in the city of Pisa, *cf.* Heuvel on *Th.* I 421.

rasere: An extra compliment. *Radere* means 'to rub smooth, to file', and so, metaphorically, is also used for literature (in the same sense as *limatus*): *OLD* 4a, see Ov. *Pont.* II 4, 17 *meus lima rasus liber*, Mart. IV 10, 1 *rasa...fronte...libellus*, for style: Pers. 1, 85 *rasis...antithetis*, Quint. *Inst.* IX 4, 17. St., here and IV 6, 27 (above), is apparently the only one to use it for sculpture, combining its literal meaning (Lucr. V 1267, Verg. *G.* II 358) with the complimentary one: all Phidias' works are highly polished.

ab arte: *Ab* with impersonal agents is not infrequent, esp. with *ars*: *LHSz.* 122, see *Th.* VI 317 *qua suetus ab arte mulceri*, Prop. III 25, 5, Ov. *Ars* III 545 *placida mollitur ab arte, Fast.* II 764, III 321, *TLL* I 36, 29 ff. (not all instances of the formula *ab arte* are relevant), Hand 27-8, Bömer on Ov. *Fast.* II 764 (many instances, also of *ab* with other impersonal agents).

Polycliteo: IV 6, 28 *Polycliteis iussum spirare caminis*, Col. X 30. *Polycliti* is equally well possible metrically, but St. does not employ it, *cf.* II 1, 124-5n., II 4, 30n.

vivere caelo: *Cf.* IV 6, 26 *vivant quae marmora caelo Praxitelis*[22].

The idea that art is so realistic that it resembles life occurs already in Homer: *Il.* XVIII 539, 548 ff., *Od.* XIX 229 ff. It is important in all kinds of appreciations of Greek sculptures (e.g. *AP* IX 724 πλάττεις ἔμπνοα καὶ σὺ Μύρων, XVI 159) and anecdotes about Greek painters.

The *topos* has special relevance for Roman art with its realistic portraiture, *cf.* Austin on Verg. *A.* VI 847 ff. The theme is prominent in St.: I 1, 48, I 3, 48, III 1, 95, IV 6, 26, 28, V 1, 2, *Th.* I 547, II 216, IV 132 ff., VI 269, VII 59, IX 337, *Ach.* I 332. It fits his admiration for art compared to nature, see 52-62n., 91n. For the *topos* in general: Verg. *G.* III 34, Heuvel on *Th.* I 547, Bömer on Ov. *Met.* VI 104, X 240 ff. and 250 (Pygmalion), Enk on Prop. II 31, 8 *vivida signa.*

68-72. aera... ab Isthmiacis...favillis: 'Bronze from Isthmian ashes', i.e. *aes Corinthium*, a kind of bronze which was highly valued in Rome: Paus. II 3, 3, Cic. *S. Rosc.* 133, *Parod.* 13, 36, Verg. *G.* II 494, Plin. *Nat.*

---

[22] In the Concordance both these lines stand under *caelum*, 'sky'. There is no lemma *caelum*, 'graving tool', 'chisel' (*cf.* e.g. Cic. *Luc.* 85, Mart. IV 39, 4).

XXXIV 1 *ante argentum ac paene etiam ante aurum*, Sen. *Dial.* XI 12, 2 (critical), Mart. IX 59, 11 (mocking), Plin. *Ep.* III 1, 9 *etc.*

The secret of its mixture was lost. The story went that it came into existence by accident, when all precious metals in Corinth melted together in the fire which destroyed the city in 146 B.C.: Plin. *Nat.* XXXIV 6, Fl. *Epit.* II 16, the parody Petr. 50, Bömer on Ov. *Met.* IV 416, *RE* III 895-6.

Isthmiacus: 'Corinthian': Lunderstedt 44, *Onom.*, see *Isthmiae* in II 7, 2. The metonymy occurs apparently only here and, for Corinth's colony Syracuse, at Sil. XIII 341, XIV 642.

ab...favillis: 'originating from the ashes'. For this construction of *a* with a noun, denoting cause or origin: Var. *R.* II 11, 2 *lac...a valentibus*, Cic. *ND* II 129 *calor a sole*, Vitr. V 10, 3 *a vapore umor*, Luc. IV 153 *gelidos a gurgite...artus*, Plin. *Nat.* XXIX 86 *dolor a morsu*, Sil. X 5 *letum...ab ense*, Mart. X 6, 5 *a Caesare pulvis, TLL* I 28, 36 ff., *cf.* 41 ff., 30, 64 ff. See II 5, 27-30n.

aera: the plur. predominates over the sing. since Augustan poetry (46/6), but not yet in Lucr. (3/10), to avoid the monosyllable: Maas 522, *cf.* Bednara 555. St. never has the sing. in nom./acc., always in abl./gen.[23].

ducum...vatum...sapientum: 'Kings, poets (not 'prophets': Mozl.), philosophers', see 63-72n. Elter (in Vollm.) thinks that the tripartition betrays Stoic origin, but this seems much too rigid.

For the many statues in Roman villas: 63-72n., Wace 160-1.

ora...ora: Like *una...una* (83), repetition of a word within the line, at significant points (verse-initial and beginning of the 5th foot), without a new thought which prompts anaphora (*cf.* 42-4n.). Nouns: *Th.* V 139, *Epic. Drusi* 195, VFl. III 144, Sil. III 425, VII 305, verbs: II 3, 9, III 5, 62, IV 1, 40, IV 2, 16, Verg. *Ecl.* 8 (*passim*) *ducite ab urbe domum, mea carmina, ducite Daphnim* (this line points to Theocritus and to Alexandrian literature in general as the source for these repetitions, see Vollm. on line 83), *Eleg. Maec.* 19, 44, VFl. VII 169, *cf.* II 1, 38-9n. Other words: *Graia* 95, *ut* II 3, 51, *Eleg. Maec.* 44, VFl. VII 198.

It is especially frequent with pronouns: for *unus* (83): *Th.* II 620, III 148, Verg. *A.* III 435; other ones in this poem: 25, 50, 70, 95, besides e.g. I 2, 16 *te*, 47 *hic*, I 4, 62 *hunc*, II 1, 214 *his*, II 3, 70 *idem.* For Sts.' habit of punctuating a longer section by pronouns: II 1, 56-66n., II 2, 42-44n.

Similar are repetitions like *deus ille deus*: IV 6, 36 = V 1, 237 = V 5, 69 = *Th.* V 751 = Lucr. V 8 = Verg. *Ecl.* 5, 64.

---

[23] The Concordance puts I 3, 54 *aera* (sky) under *aes*.

Sometimes more space intervenes (not taking into account pronouns, conjunctions etc.): II 1, 127-8, II 6, 8-10 *famulum*, 14-5 *hominem*, *Th.* V 71-5, VIII 219-22. With polyptoton: II 1, 47-8 *mixtae...mixta*, II 6, 6-7 *alte...altius* (n.), II 6, 81-2 *saeva...saevius* (see 96), II 7, 89-92 *saevae...saeva*, see *cura...curarum* below.

The technique of repetition is more frequently employed by St. in the *Silv.* than in the epics, see Mulder on *Th.* II 620; possibly improvisation plays a part here. As Vollm. points out (on 83), there generally is a kind of climax (*steigerndes Moment*): in 83 *procul* and *eminent*, here *sapientum* (for Pollius is first and foremost *sapiens*) and the fact that this last item is the longest one.

For the jingle in *potiora...ora...ora*: II 1, 69-72n.

For the genitive form of *sapientum*, see II 7, 115-9n.

tibi: For the sudden address to Pollius: II 1, 52-4n. (*tibi*), 102-5n.

cura sequi...curarum: The inf. with *cura* (*est*, like IV 4, 46, V 1, 86, V 2, 91, *Th.* I 149, V 454, VII 339, VIII 693, 737, IX 159, 618, X 35) occurs since Vergil: *TLL* IV 1456, 20 ff., *LHSz.* 349, also at *Th.* I 149, V 454, VII 339, VIII 693, IX 618.

curarum: is used in a different meaning from *cura* shortly before it. The same goes for *Th.* V 71-5 *frigida cura tori...cura viris*, II 1, 47-8 *mixta*(*e*), II 1, 166-9 *horror*, II 3, 44-7 *dura*(*e*), see II 3, 22-3n. Markl. conjectured *turbarum* (ταραχῶν, *cf.* Sil. XII 502), accepted by Rinn, Clouard, '*fort. recte*': Postgate. But *curarum* is right: in 147 and 149 *curae...curarum* (probably in a different sense) are used for Polla, who is one with her husband (153-4).

sentis: Almost religious in intent: Hor. *Ep.* II 1, 134 *praesentia numina sentit*, Ov. *Fast.* VI 251 *caelestia numina sensi.* A similar ending: Ov. *Met.* X 443 *toto pectore sentit.*

animum virtute quieta compositus: Together with *expers curarum*, is equivalent to ἀτάρακτος. Both *compositus* (*animum*) and *quieta* refer to placidness: Ov. *Ars* III 572 *composita vulnera mente feret*, Sen. *Ep.* 89, 9 (*philosophia*) *componit animum, cf.* 55, 8; 56, 14; 99, 20, *cf.* 26n. here.

For *virtus*: I 3, 91-2 *virtus...gravis*, II 3, 65. The same notions in 124 ff., 131 ff.

semper...tuus: 'Always your own master', *cf.* II 6, 52-3n. St. means that Pollius is *voto sublimior omni exemptus fatis* (125-6), see Sen. *Ep.* 75, 18 *tranquillitas animi et expulsis erroribus* (*cf.* 137) *absoluta libertas. Quaeris quae sit ista? Non homines timere non deos* (125); *nec turpia velle nec nimia; in se ipsum habere maximam potestatem: inaestimabile bonum est suum fieri.* Less technical: Ov. *Met.* VIII 35-6 *vix sua...virgo...erat*, III 689, XIV 166, [Tib.] III 2, 16.

Cancik (1968 n. 36) thinks that St. alludes to Hor. *Ep.* I 14, 1 ff., *mihi me reddentis agelli, cf.* I 18, 107, *S.* II 7, 86 (*sapiens*) *in se ipso totus, teres atque rotundus.*

72-97.: Two catalogues of about equal length: one of views (76-85) and one of precious marbles (85-94). The connection between the two, which is made roughly in the middle of the poem, is Naples: the room with a view on Naples is the one that both literally and metaphorically is the most eminent: by its marbles and because it shows Greek Naples.

The importance of Naples as a Greek city is explicitly stated in the concluding 3 vss. (95-7).

Pollius is a citizen of that city, like St. himself, as he aptly mentions again (97, *cf.* 6 *patrii*, 9 *gentile*); but most important of all is its Greek culture, which is a central trait in Pollius (and St., *cf. General Intr.* § 1 and § 2, II 1, 3-7n., II 6, 24-5n.).

A second noteworthy point in the connection of the catalogues is the interpenetration of inside and outside, room and view. This is stressed in the opening lines 72-5, see *Intr.*, 36-106n.

Moreover 'all along we are kept aware of both art and nature', in the shifting of attention from art to natural views in 72 ff. and back to art again in 85 ff. ('both of them at Pollius' beck and call'), 'as well as the tenuous distinction between them', *cf.* 91, 93: Pavlovskis 14-5.

72-5.: A short introduction to the catalogues, beginning with the formula *quid...revolvam*, see *Intr.*, II 1, 96n., Verg. *A.* II 101 *sed quid ego haec...revolvo.* The difference between land and sea is stressed, as well in height (*culmina*) as in rank (*servit*). The subject of the catalogues is announced: *visendi* (42-4n.), both the rooms (*thalamo*) and their view (*mare, fenestris*).

mille: St. is fond of this hyperbolical *mille.* He has it 34 times, see e.g. III 5, 105 *mille...nostrae telluris amores.*

culmina visendique vices: 'The high points and changes in seeing', that is 'the numberless summits and the changing views' (Mozl.). *Culmina* are the roofs of the different buildings of the villa: III 1, 79-80 *multo culmine dives mons nitet*, Mart. IV 64, 10 *celsae culmina delicata villae*, Luc. VI 28, *OLD* 1a. Rather than the roofs, St. means the vantage-points within the buildings, as also suggested by *eminet* (*diaeta*) 83. Scriverius conjectured *lumina* for *culmina* (see van Dam 390), but this is unnecessary, and its required meaning 'windows' occurs only in technical contexts: *TLL* VII^2 1814, 1 ff.

visendi vices belongs, I think, closely with *culmina*: changes in views, that is, the chance to see things from these high parts of the villa. The gen. must be explained as subjective (not objective as Vollm. and Fr. 67

n. 4 state, who explain the phrase as 'the variety in what is seen', *viz.* the islands mentioned in 76 ff.): with each window the possibility of seeing is changed. For the subj. gen.: *Th.* III 558 *astrorum...vices,* X 754 *belli...vices,* XII 552. The gerund with *vices* is not attested elsewhere in St., Lucr., Catul., Prop., Tib., Verg., Sen., Luc., Pers., Sil., VFl., Mart. But see Ov. *Pont.* II 10, 35 *saepe brevis nobis vicibus via visa loquendi* and *cf.* Sil. IX 152-3 *verba vicesque alloquio.*

For the preference for different views from one room: 50-1n. The villa of Pollius is one of those denounced by the indignant Seneca: *Ep.* 89, 21 *omnibus locis...tecta vestra resplendeant* (*cf.* III 1, 79-80 above), *aliubi imposita montibus in vastum terrarum marisque prospectum.*

The view here is the most important one, that across the sea: 'A good view of the sea was a main desideratum', d'Arms 46. Cicero's friend M. Marius made a window so big as to have an outlook of the whole bay: *Fam.* VII 1, 1, *Ac.* II 80, *Q.Fr.* II 12, 1.

73-4.: 'Each room has its own delight and its special sea, and across the calm Nereus various windows are served each by its own land'. *Cuique* corresponds with *omni, sua* with *proprium,* and again with *sua. Proprium* gives more stress, but the interchangeability of *suus* and *proprius* in Late Latin begins already with Hor., see *LHSz.* 179.

74-5. omni proprium thalamo mare...diversis...sua terra fenestris: That each room had its own sea and (more specifically) each window its own land, is not due to the fact that ancient windows were narrow and small (Vollm.), see the instance from Cicero above, Plin. *Ep.* II 17, 5 *undique valvas aut fenestras non minores valvis habet* (*triclinium*), 10 *cenatio quae plurimo sole, plurimo mari lucet,* 12.

St. wants to say that sea and land (in the sea and across it) look different from each part of the house: Plin. II 17, 5 **quasi** *tria maria prospectat,* Guillemin 1929, 126 ff., Rostovtzeff 1911, 77. He represents a way of looking at Nature that is sometimes considered as typically Roman: 'Life in the country looked outward...through the eyes of the villa. Its shell was pierced by viewfinding apertures...it directed the outlook of the owner...sorting vistas out of the field of vision and cutting the spread of landscape into significant segments': Brown 21, see Cancik 1968 n. 16. The framed murals in Roman villas may be considered as a concrete instance of this visual attitude, *cf.* 42-4n.

iacentem Nerea...servit: The military metaphor of 52 ff. is repeated, *cf.* 52-62n. The idea is slightly different: Nature exists for man's pleasure, as a slave, whereas in 52-62 it has to be subjugated. For *servit:* Plin. *Ep.* I 3, 1 *subiectus et serviens lacus,* V 6, 23 *piscinam quae fenestris servit ac subiacet.* In Greek δουλεύω, ἡττάομαι, νικάω are not used in this sense or

context, see Cancik 1968, 69 with n. 25, Drerup 1957 n. 87, see 109 *servitium*, IV 3, 81 *servitus*.

iacere in this context does not simply refer to topographic position, ('to extend': *OLD* 12). The suggestion of submission, given by *servit*, is present in *iacere* also: *TLL* VII 27, 82 '*succumbere, victum, subiugatum esse*': *Th.* VII 86-8 *debellatasque relinquit Eurus aquas... pontumque iacentem exanimis iam volvit hiems*, Luc. III 523-4 *servatum bello iacuit mare.*

Nerea: Nereus as a metonymy for 'sea' occurs since Call. *Hymn. Jov.* 38 ff. In Latin since Prop. IV 6, 25, Tib. IV 1, 58. St. goes far in his use of this metonymy: *Th.* III 410 = V 437 *profundi Nereos*, V 48 *circumflua Nereo*, VIII 230, *sulcatum Nerea tauro, Ach.* I 542. See Grosz 386-8 and for other metonymies for the sea 333.

On the words for sea: 49-51n.

76-85. Catalogue of islands: A catalogue of almost the same islands and places occurs at III 1, 147-53. There it stresses Hercules' importance (Pavlovskis 15 n. 45). Here attractive places, with all their mythological and etymological accessories, are mentioned, culminating in Naples: 72-97n. The islands could in all probability really be seen from the villa.

By mentioning the country of origin in the following catalogue of marbles St. subtly 'extends the range of beautiful spots over which Pollius' fancy can roam' (Pavlovskis *loc. cit.*), *cf.* II 1, 159-62n. (on the use of spices), II 4, 27-37n., II 6, 24-5n. In I 3, 83 ff., St. gives a catalogue of other possessions of Vopiscus which are inferior to his Tiburtinum, *cf.* 81-2n. here, 108-111n., II 6, 61-8 and for a variation of the theme 'the world is at your feet': V 3, 162 ff. (the pupils of Sts.' father come from the whole of Italy), Mart. X 30, 5-10.

The catalogue goes from west to east (but see on 82) and is constructed in pairs with variation in connectives and syntax: *haec...illinc, hac...inde, inde...que, et...que. Inarimen* (acc.) / *Prochyta* (nom.), *armiger... Hectoris* (periphrase) / *circumflua Nesis* (etymology), *omen Euploea* (etymology) / *ferit fluctus* (change of subject), *Limon* (nom.) / *Parthenopen* (acc.). For the personifications: 50-1n.

76. Inarimen...Prochyta: *Inarime* is Ischia, also called *Aenaria* in Latin. The name is created by Vergil (*A.* IX 716). It arose out of a misunderstanding. Homer (*Il.* II 783) says that Typheus lies εἰν 'Αρίμοις, which was read as one word by Vergil, who located this dungeon at Ischia, possibly because of the superficial similarity with *Aenaria.* Later poets imitated this name: Ov. *Met.* XIV 89, Luc. V 101, VFl. III 208, Sil. VIII 541, Claud. *Rapt.* III 184 *etc.*, see Plin. *Nat.* III 208 *Aenaria...Homero Inarime dicta.* In St. also III 5, 104, *Th.* X 917, see Kroll 1924, 294, Williams on *Th. loc. cit.*, van Wees 125-6.

Prochyta (*Proclita*: M, *Prochyta*: KQR) is now *Procida*. It is mentioned together with Inarime in Verg. *A*. IX 715, Ov. *Met.* XIV 89, Sil. VIII 541, XII 148-9. Its name was connected with Greek προχέω by ancient etymology (Serv. on *A*. IX 715), because tradition had it that the island had broken off from Cape Misenum or Ischia: Strabo I 3, 19, IV 1, 6, Plin. *Nat.* II 203, III 208. Vergil may allude to this etymology[24], but there is no reason to think that St. does.

aspera: *alta* in Verg. *loc. cit.*, which St. seems to emulate. Both Klotz (1896) and Vollm. remark that the island is, in fact, flat. St. and Vergil probably allude to the fact that it rises steeply out of the sea, see also Fr. 67 n. 6. Vollm. connects *asper* with embossing; the island seems, as it were, embossed on the sea, see *Ach.* I 723 (*clipeus*) *auro...asper*, III 1, 38 *torus asper eburnis*, VFl. V 578 *nodis...balteus asper*, (absolute): Prop. II, 6, 17 *aspera...pocula*, Juv. 14, 62, *OLD* 2a, Rothstein on Prop. *loc. cit.*

paret: With the same sense as *apparet*, like *Th.* V 603, Sen. *Ag.* 457, Mart. XII 28, 18, *OLD* 5, *cf.* Sil. XII 147-8 *apparet Prochyte...apparet ...Inarime.*

77-8. armiger...magni...Hectoris: Cape Misenum, after the Trojan squire Misenus, whose death is described at Verg. *A*. VI 162 ff. The association of Misenus and cape Misenum occurs also in Mela II 4, Prop. III 18, 3, Sil. XII 155-6, see Austin on *A*. VI 162. In St.: III 5, 98 *Iliaco iugum memorabile remo*, IV 7, 19-20 *liticen...notus Hectoris armis*, V 3, 167-8 *lituo remoque notatus collis* (see Verg. *A*. VI 233-4), *cf.* III 1, 151.

armiger: II 1, 94-5n.

patet: 'Is visible', like *Th.* V 298, 395, X 551, XII 29, *Silv.* I 5, 52, Ov. *Tr.* III 10, 20, *OLD* 6a[25].

hac: Markl. conjectured *hinc* here and for *et* in 81, creating a double *hinc...inde* which destroys the variation.

pelago circumflua Nesis: The present island Nisida, also in III 1, 148 *fixam pelago Nesida*, Luc. VI 90-1 *tali spiramine Nesis emittit Stygium nebulosis aera saxis*, Sen. *Ep.* 53, 1. Both Lucan and St. (*aera respirat...maligna*) allude to its volcanic nature. A villa of Lucullus stood on it: Cic. *Att.* XIV 20, 1, XVI 1, 1.

circumflua pelago opposes it to the foregoing cape. But it also plays with the etymology νῆσος/Νησίς (a reason why M's *Nessis*, also in some mss. of Lucan, is a mistake, see *Nesīda* in III 1), *cf.* 36-42n.

circumflua, 'flowed round', passive here, as most often: V 2, 137, *Th.* V 49 *circumflua Nereo Lemnos, al.*, see *OLD* 2a. For the active meaning, see *Th.* II 5 with Mulder's note.

[24] Thus van Wees 125-6, not in Bartelink.

[25] The Concordance puts three forms of *patior* (*Th.* VI 935, *Ach.* I 17, *Silv.* II 6, 65) under *pateo*.

malignum: For harmful things, or obstacles, e.g. Calp. *Ecl.* 4, 115 *malignum dolium*, esp. for natural phenomena: V 1, 146 *maligno...Noto*, Prud. *Symm.* II 976-7 *maligni aeris ex vitio*: Mulder on *Th.* II 498, *TLL* VIII 184, 8 ff., esp. 38 ff.

79-80. Euploea: Thus σ and M in III 1, 149. Here M has replaced the unfamiliar name by the better known *Euboea*.

Euploea refers to the temple of Ἀφροδίτη εὐπλοία on the promontory of Pizzo Falcone, where the old city of Naples stood. It is mentioned at *IG* XIV 745, *cf.* Beloch 72, R. M. Peterson 200, *PP* 395, Fr. 68 n. 3. The word does not occur elsewhere: Speranza 1956, 39.

St. calls it *omen felix* here and in III 1, 149 to render the Greek εὐπλοία, *cf.* 36-42n. For the phrase *omen felix*, see e.g. *Th.* II 195, (*felicia omina*), Ov. *Met.* X 5, *Pont.* II 1, 35.

vagis...carinis: The common metonymy *carina* (keel) = boat occurs already since Enn. *Ann.* 573. Very often in St., in the *Silv.* also: I 2, 124, 246, I 4, 120, III 1, 149, III 2, 1, 60, IV 3, 39, V 3, 238, see Lunderstedt 18-9.

For *vagis* see III 1, 4 *vagis nautis.*

Megalia: A small island near Naples, now called Castel dell'Uovo. It was also called *Megaris*: Plin. *Nat.* III 82 *Megaris...inter Pausylipon et Neapolim.* The name may be semitic (given by the Phoenicians): Beloch 81, Bérard 72, Fr. 68 n. 4. In that case it means 'the island with the grottoes'.

ferit curvos exserta...fluctus: Markl. contended that it should have been *feritur fluctibus* (in his *Addenda*). He conjectured *premit*, conferring Rut. Nam. I 315. Heinsius wrote *terit*, accepted by Klotz 1896. But Fr. *app.crit.* aptly quotes Luc. VIII 698 *litora Pompeium feriunt* and IX 336 *terra ferit puppes.*

This phenomenon, something what we would call a syntactic reversal of the main concepts, occurs more often and serves to focus upon the least expected of the two participants, generally involving personification. In St. it occurs for instance at *Ach.* I 100 *feriunt vada plantas* (*'vocabula quibus maxima vis inest subiecti vices fungi voluit poeta'*: Brinkgreve *ad loc.*), *Th.* I 149 *mero committere gemmas* (=*pocula*), *Ach.* I 38-9 *cunabula parvo commisimus*, Silv. IV 8, 37 *cumulare altaribus ignes*, see Legras 1905, 321-2.

Hübner (1972 and 1975) has drawn attention to the phenomenon in Lucan and others: Lucan is the first to give *ferire* a non-moving subject (1975, n. 7 and n. 8, *TLL* VI[1] 514, 74-8, Claud. *Carm.* 26, 341). See also Luc. II 155-6 *hic...dissiluit percussus humo*, Sen. *Tro.* 1114-5 *pondus ad terram datum...silicis impulsu*, Luc. VI 757-7 *cadaver...terra repulsum*, Ov. *Met.* II 786 *impressa tellurem reppulit hasta* (see *Ach.* I 100 above and con-

trast Verg. *G.* IV 233 *pede reppulit amnes*), IV 710 *pedibus tellure repulsa*, VI 512 *admotum fretum remis* (with Bömer's note), 783 *aere repercusso, Fast.* VI 708 *caesa recesserunt a cute membra sua* (Marsyas), Enn. *Ann.* 230 *pectora pellite tonsis* (oars), Luc. III 2 *mediumque rates movere profundum*, Verg. *A.* III 61 *dare classibus austros*, VI 353-4 *excussa magistro...navis* (Serv.: '*nove dixit*'), *G.* III 140 *iuga ducere plaustris*, Hübner 1972, 200-1, 211. Merrill quotes the *varia lectio* at Sil. I 208 *geminae...cautes maria...fatigant.*

exserta: 'Protruding', from the mainland. It supports *ferit*, as Vollm. says.

quaeque...Megalia: The attraction of the subject into the relative clause is also found at I 3, 88-9 *quae...revocabunt litora*, II 4, 20, 21 (*cf.* 28), *Th.* X 746, 807, II 1, 202-5n., *LHSz.* 564.

curvus: The waves are curving to attack: *Th.* II 381 *irata...terrae...curva...unda*, V 374-5, XI 437, Ov. *Met.* XI 505.

81-2. angitur et...proculque...tuus spectat praetoria Limon: *Limon* (: Q, *Limau*: M, *Liman*: A*) is another possession of Pollius, see *Intr.* under **IV**, III 1, 149 *placidus Limon.* As Fr. (67 n. 5) points out, St. goes back from east to west here, to single out this place as an especially important one.

angitur: 'To be distressed', or, more specifically, 'to be jealous' (an interpretation it does not get elsewhere in St.). The rivalry between different possessions for the master's favour is also mentioned in 111 *placent* (n.), I 3, 4 *certantisque sibi dominum defendere villas*, III 1, 82-3. The sentence then means 'and your Limon is jealous, because its master reclines opposite, and from far away looks at the Surrentine palace'. This is the general interpretation, already given by Domitius.

et: Is postponed 'and' in that case. Vollm. claims that this occurs often ('et *an zweiter Stelle, wie oft*'). There are important differences, however, in the frequency of this postposition between poets: Vergil is the first poet where it occurs[26], though one instance may be earlier: *CE* 55, 6 (*aetate Caesaris*, according to Baehrens, *cf.* Norden 1912^2 403 n. 1). Haupt (*Opuscula* I 115 ff., an important investigation) counted 40 examples in Vergil (confirmed by Norden *A.* VI, *Anhang* III). In Ovid's *Met.* it is very rare (not found by Haupt, 4 times according to Marouzeau 1949, 78), seldom also in his elegiacs. It is not infrequent in Prop. and Tib., most often in the pentameter. Often in Hor. *Carm.* and *S.*, only twice in his *Ep.* There are over 90 occurrences in Man., 42 in VFl., 60 in Mart., but only 6 in Sil., 2 or 3 in Juv.: *TLL* V^2 897, 65 ff.

---

[26] Haupt (*Obs. crit.* 42-53 = *Opuscula* I 115 ff.) found several instances of it in Lucr., but these are all corrupt, *cf.* Bailey on Lucr. III 530, *TLL* V 897, 57.

In *Silv.* II, I found 3 or 5 examples, which seems, indeed, rather a high frequency (3 or 5 in 775 lines, which is about a book of an epic). But the number is too small to extrapolate from it.

Of these occurences *et* follows an adverb 3 times: II 1, 181 *sic et*, II 2, 90 *hic et*, 104 *saepe et* (4 in Vergil). In the 2 doubtful cases it follows a verb: here and II 3, 56 *sperat et* (n.), against 6 in Verg., often in Prop. at the beginning of a line after a bisyllabic verb, e.g. I 2, 11 *surgat et*, I 19, 23, III 18, 10, *cf.* Marouzeau 1949, 79. Vergil's favourite construction, adjective-*et*-noun or *vice versa* (15 times), does not occur in *Silv.* II.

The reason for this postposition is metrical; or the poet wishes to highlight an otherwise inconspicuous word, see Norden *loc. cit.*, Artymowicz *passim.*

et might also function in the sense of *etiam* here. For this (ancient) sense, see Hand II 517 ff., Marouzeau 1949, 70 ff., Conington on Verg. *A.* II 49 *timeo Danaos et dona ferentes*, Ov. *Ep.* 20, 183, and for the postposition of this *et* since Vergil: *TLL* V[2] 915, 76 ff. Then *et* means 'even' here and *recubante* must be interpreted as concessive. *Et* can be explained as *etiam* at II 1, 17, II 6, 4, 5, 54, 104. The phrase then means 'Limon is distressed even though its master can be seen across the sea', with the same implication *viz.* that it longs for Pollius. But *recubante* refers to self-sufficient happiness, opposed to *angitur* (e.g. Lucr. I 38, Verg. *Ecl.* 1, 38) and *procul spectat* gets more point if envy is implied, see *invideant* 96. On the whole the explanation of *et* as connective postponed 'and' is preferable.

Markl., not satisfied with both *et* and *-que* proposed *hinc* (77-8n.)...*procul qui* (impossible: II 6, 15-7n.), Baehr. wrote *hac* for *et* and Saenger *en.*

For postposition of *sed*, see II 1, 82-6n., of *nec*, see II 6, 91-2n., of *quod*, see 85-9n. below.

praetoria: 48-9n.

83-5.: At the juncture of these two catalogues St. returns to Pollius: *tibi*, announced by *domino* (81), *tuus* (82). At the end of the second one he does the same thing: *probas, frequentas, te* (95-6). This same reversal to the protagonist occurs in 60-2, 70-2, *cf.* II 1, 102-5n. Sometimes this goes together with a mythological allusion (II 1, 88-102n.): *Parthenopen* here, Arion and the others in 60-2, *Dicarchus* 96, *cf.* 118-20n.

una...una: 68-72n., emphatically opposed to *cunctis*, underlined by the pleonasm of *procul eminet.*

procul eminet: The same combination occurs at *Th.* IV 221-2 *procul...metuendus in hasta eminet.*

eminere is both literal and metaphorical: this room is the highest one, and also the most important one. This same double meaning: I 2, 114-6 *Latias...ultra emineat matres...quantum...egomet Nereidas exto.*

procul, in the interpretation *eminere* = to excel, means *longe*. For this meaning of *procul*: II 6, 6-8n.

eminere: is constructed with abl. here, as in *Ach.* I 58 *placidis...undis eminet, Th.* IV 165 *Capaneus omnibus eminet*, VFl. III 337-8 *medio rex aggere...eminet.* For this kind of abl., see *LHSz.* 103 (compounds where the preposition governs the abl.). *Eminere* 'to excel' is never construed with abl. (which caused Markland to write *ante tamen cunctas...diaetas*): *TLL* V^2 490, 46 ff., 491, 66 ff. But the double meaning softens the construction here.

diaetis: Generally an outhouse, an annexe, consisting of several apartments: Plin. *Ep.* II 17, 20 *diaeta...amores mei...ipse posui. In hac heliocaminus...alia xystum, alia mare,...cubiculum autem...fenestra prospicit mare*, V 6, 27, VI 16, 14 *area ex qua diaeta adibatur ita iam cinere...oppleta surrexerat, ut si longior in cubiculo mora*, probably also Suet. *Claud.* 10, 1. It does not necessarily stand apart, but may be part of the house (Sherwin-White at Plin. *Ep.* II 17, 20), as V 6, 20 and 21. It may also refer to one room only (*OLD* 2a) as Plin. *Ep.* II 17, 12 *turris sub qua diaetae duo, totidem in ipsa*, probably also V 6, 28, *cf.* Petr. 115, where it is used for a cabin on a ship. In Plin. *Ep.* II 17, 15 and VII 5, 1 it is not clear whether one or more rooms are meant, *cf.* Vollm., *TLL* IV 947, 68 ff.

Here one room is suggested, since there is only one view, but it could very well refer to a small pavilion, standing apart, consisting of one room where one could also sleep. It would be one of the *innumerae domus* (III 1, 78-9), high on the mountain (*eminet*), see Plin. *Ep.* V 6, 27 (differently Sherwin-White).

Parthenopen: 1-3n.

derecto limite ponti: 'Over a straight track of sea'. For *derecto limite*, see *recto limite*: *Th.* II 61, V 736, *al.*, Sen. *Thy.* 803, VFl. IV 614, *non flexo limite ponti* Luc. III 218, *prono limite Silv.* IV 3, 109, *directo itinere* Caes. *Gal.* II 24, 4, *directa via* Tac. *Dial.* 19, 1, *cf.* Mulder on *Th.* II 61.

For *limite ponti*: Luc. III above, *limite caeli* at *Th.* II 61, III 502, Luc. VII 363.

ingerere: 'To obtrude on a person's notice... (a sight, fact *etc.*)': *OLD* 3b, Vell. II 126, 1 *opera...cum ingerantur oculis*, Sen. *Nat.* VII 25, 5 (*stellae*) *quae se ingerunt nobis*, Luc. VII 798-9, VFl. VII 52-3.

85-93. Catalogue of marbles: Marbles were employed in great quantity to decorate Roman houses: Sen. *Con.* II 1, 12 *Ad delicias dementis luxuriae lapis omnis eruitur...varius ille lapis et tenui fronte parietem tegit*, Sen. *Ep.* 86, 6, 115, 9, *Ben.* IV 6, 2, Juv. 14, 89-95 (all criticizing the fashion). Plin. *Nat.* XXXV 2 tells that marble as adornment was replacing painting: *nunc...in totum marmoribus pulsa...nec tantum ut parietes toti operiantur...*

coepimus et lapide pingere...Neronis (principatu)...maculas...inserendo unitatem variare (inventum est), see 88-9 below: *SG* III[10] 333 ff., Drerup 1957, Cancik 1965, 77 with literature.

The poets did not criticise these kinds of decoration as sharply as most prose authors. They mention it in descriptions at *Culex* 398 ff., Ov. *Met.* XIII 678 ff., XIV 311-4, Luc. X 111 ff., Mart. VI 42, 11 ff., IX 75, 6 ff. St. and his imitator Sid., however, have the most extensive and enthusiastic catalogues: I 2, 148-53, I 5, 34-41, IV 2, 26-30, *cf.* I 3, 35, 47-51, Sid. *Carm.* 5, 34-9; 11, 17-9; 22, 136-41, see Cancik 1965, n. 37, Szelest 1966, 195 n. 34.

Colour and splendour are important again (II 1, 36-136n.): *picto, candida, purpureo, viret, lucent, flaventia, spectare.* Drerup 1957 draws attention to the typically Roman interest in polished, shining surfaces, a preference for γλαφυρία over the Greek ideal of harmonious form, συμμετρία, see also Gaymann 30, Cancik 1965 n. 36.

Elter (*ap.* Vollm.) claims that the catalogue proceeds from south to north and from east to west, but this claim can not be upheld: the first and southernmost of the geographical names is explicitly characterized as *Eoae*, eastern, Laconia is not more northerly than Phrygia, and the most western of the marbles, Numidian (92), comes in the middle of the catalogue. I think not more can be said than that there is no special order to be discerned: it is different from that in the other catalogues (a little, from that in I 2, more from the others) and they are different from each other. The order of the colours and countries of origin is different again in Sidonius' descriptions.

There is no reason to suppose that a catalogue existed in the schools of rhetoric for imitation by St., as Lohrisch (106) does, *cf.* Fr. 24 n. 5. Nor is the learning here 'a clear mark of this poem's debt to the epyllia' (Bishop 1951, 427 ff.[27]).

The marbles are called *Graia* (85) though only part of them comes from Greece (the 2nd, 5th, 6th, 7th). The best-known marbles, Pentelic, Hymettic, Parian are all omitted here: Gaymann 28. For Greece: 72-97n.

85-9. penitus delecta metallis saxa: *Penitus* goes with *metallis*: 'deep in the quarries'.

metallis: the use of *metallum*, mine, for a quarry of stones originates in this time: I 5, 36, III 1, 5, IV 3, 99, *cf.* IV 4, 23 *metalliferae...Lunae* = Carrara, Sil. VIII 480, Lunderstedt 66.

[27] The influence of *epyllia* upon the *Silvae* is nowhere made probable by Bishop, if it were only because he gives no satisfactory definition of an *epyllion.* If description is made an essential characteristic of the *epyllion*, as Bright does (15, with notes 32 and 33), the case for its influence on St. becomes much stronger.

delecta: 'chosen': only the best marble is employed. The 15th-century conjecture *desecta* (ascribed to Avantius, see Kl. *app.*, read by Baehr. and Clouard), *cf.* I 5, 36-7 *decisa metallis marmora*, weakens the text.

saxa: 'marbles': I 2, 149, I 5, 12, II 2, 92, III 1, 94, III 3, 200, IV 2, 28, V 1, 233, not in the epics (only *saxosa*: *Th.* VII 370), see Lunderstedt 64. Already in Cic. *Luc.* 101, Hor. *Carm.* IV 8, 7.

quod...Syenes: 'The marble which the vein of eastern Syene has sprinkled'. *Quot* (here and 87): M, *quod*: Q^2R.

Syenites lapis was a kind of reddish granite. Its use in Italy was rare: Plin. *Nat.* XXXVI 63, Fr. 68 n. 7. It is also mentioned in IV 2, 27.

Though Syene is in the deep south of Egypt (the present Assuan), and it is especially known as the place where the sun is in the zenith at noon (Luc. II 587), St. calls it eastern, *eous.* He calls Nubia eastern also at III 2, 101-2 *Isi...numen...orientis, Th.* IV 705-7 *se...suppressit in antris Nilus et Eoae liquentia pabula brumae ore premit*, VIII 359-60 *pabula caeli Nilus et Eoas...bibit pruinas.* There are several explanations for this: in the first place Egypt is east of Rome. Secondly, Roman poets often disregard geography and the results of expeditions. This has been demonstrated at length by Kroll 1924, 293 ff., see also Dihle. Thirdly, these geographical adjectives (or nouns) have an intention of their own: they aim at pathos, create an exotic atmosphere *etc.*, see Kroll, esp. 298, van Wees 135 ff. Reasons of euphony play, I think, a part in Sts.' choice of *eoae* here.

respergit vena: *Vena* is the vein, the streaks, of the marble: I 2, 150, I 3, 36 *picturata lucentia marmora vena*, I 5, 39, *cf.* Plin. *Nat.* XXXVII 91 *varias...cum lacteis zonis...venas.*

respergit, suggesting a mottled appearance, personifies *vena*, like *fodere secures* (87), *imitatur* (91), *gaudens* (93), *cf.* 50-1n.

Synnade...gyro: 'The marble which Phrygian axes dug in mournful Synnas, in the land of the wailing Cybele, where a white surface is mottled with purple circles, giving the effect of embroidered marble'. In this interpretation *ubi distinguitur* stands for *ubi marmor invenitur quod distinguitur*, with the same brevity as *respergit vena Syenes*: *quod respersum vena* (*venis*) *est et inventum in Syene.* Then *marmore picto* is abl. resultativus, *cf.* 13-4n. The reference is to the so-called *pavonazzetto* from Synnas in Phrygia, white marble with purple spots: I 5, 37-8 *Phrygiae quae Synnados antro...cruentavit maculis lucentibus Attis*, see I 2, 148, IV 2, 37.

It is mentioned and praised often: Hor. *Carm.* III 1, 41-3, [Tib.] III 3, 13, Ov. *Ep.* 15, 142, Sen. *Ep.* 86, 6, Mart. VI 42, 13, IX 75, 7, in Sidonius and other late writers. See Strabo XII 8, 14, Vollm. on I 2, 148, Fr. 24 n. 5, I 5, 36 *app. crit.*, Blümner 1884, 51-3.

Synnas and the land of Cybele (= Phrygia) are mournful (*maesta, lugentis*) because of the death of Attis, who sprinkled the marble with his

blood: I 5, 37-8 above, Blümner *loc. cit.*, and *cf.* IV 3, 57 *maestum pelagus gementis Helles.*

quod: Is seldom postponed in the *Silv.*: only here, II 5, 27, III 1, 60[28]. In II 6, 91 it is even the third word, *cf.* 81-2n.

picto: and *distinguitur* refer to each other. We must probably not think of Pliny's remark on 'painting with marble', 85-95n.

candida purpureo: Two colours are often juxtaposed in poetry (*'dans une certaine mesure, une epithète de couleur appelle une autre epithète de couleur'*, André 1949, 351). The colours most often quoted are red/white: In St.: II 1, 41 (n.), II 7, 9-10 (n.), *Th.* II 738, IV 218, VII 48, IX 883, *Ach.* I 162, 309. For *purpureus/candidus*: Catul. 64, 308, *Ciris* 37, 102-3, Prop. I 20, 38, Ov. *Met.* X 596 (*velum* and marble). Those juxtapositions occur since Enn. (*frg.* 352) and Hellenistic poetry. They are most frequent in Verg. (14), Mart. (15), St. (19) and above all Ov. (36): André 1949, 345-51.

The colours mentioned here are red, green and yellow. Until Ov. white is by far the most frequently mentioned colour for marble, 7 times as often as coloured marble. With the change in fashion coloured marbles are described about as often as white ones. But it seems that red, yellow and green (esp. the last two) are the only colours mentioned: André 1949, 340-1. Sid. *Carm.* 11, 17-9 has *quinque colores*, but they can be brought back to these three. The order of the colours varies (also in II 1, 132-4).

gyro: 'A circle, a round spot': *picturato...gyro*: V 1, 104 (the rainbow), *viridi...gyro*: *Th.* V 550 a snake's coils (*Th.* XI 311, Verg. *A.* V 85), *Th.* XI 514 *arvaque sanguineo scribit rutilantia gyro*, see Sil. XIII 25 *ubi perrupit...calculus undam...format gyros.*

90-1. hic et...herbas: 'Here is also marble hewn from the mountain of Spartan Lycurgus, which is green and imitates the soft grass with its stones'. Marble from Laconia, *verde antico*, really porphyry from Croceae near the Eurotas, see Strabo VIII 5, 7 νεωστὶ δὲ καὶ ἐν τῷ Ταυγέτῳ μέταλλον ἀνέῳξάν τινες εὐμέγεθες, Plin. *Nat.* XXXVI 5, *Lacedaemonium viride cunctisque hilarius*, Fr. 24 n. 5, Vollm.

It is mentioned at I 2, 148, I 5, 40, [Tib.] III 3, 14, Mart. VI 42, 11, IX 75, 9, almost everywhere with mention of its green colour, also at Sid. *Carm.* 5, 41; 11, 18; 22, 139.

The *mons Lycurgi* is the Taygetus, as indicated by Strabo, *cf.* IV 8, 52-3 *horrenda Lycurgi/Taygeta*, Mart. VI 42, 11 *Taygeti virent metalla.*

---

[28] In V 2, 166 only if the corrupt tradition is accepted, see the *app. critt.* of Kl., Fr., Mar.

Amyclaei: II 1, 110-1n.
viret et: II 1, 48-9n.
rupibus: Opposes the dead, hard rock, against the living, supple (*molles*) grass. Used for marble also at I 2, 150, I 5, 39, apparently not outside St. (*OLD*).
imitatur....herbas: II 1, 111.

92. Nomadum...flaventia saxa: Numidian marble, yellow with red veins, *giallo antico*: Fr. 24 n. 5, Blümner 1884, 54. Its colour is aptly glossed by Sidonius (*Carm.* 5, 37) *Nomadum lapis...antiquum mentitus ebur*, 11, 19 *eburnea*, 22, 138, *cf.* André 1949, 132. St. mentions it at I 5, 36, IV 2, 28: *nitent, lucent* here. On Numidian marble, see also Hor. *Carm.* II 18, 4-5, Plin. *Nat.* XXXV 3, XXXVI 48, Mart. VI 42, 12, IX 75, 8.

Nomadum: *Nomas* is often used for the wandering Numidians, *cf.* Sall. *Iug.* 18, 7 *Gaetulos secum miscuere et ...semet ipsi Nomadas appellavere*, frequently for metrical convenience: *Nomadum* for *Numidarum, Nomas* for *Numidia*: Norden on Verg. *A.* VI 59, Pease on IV 320, *cf.* I 5, 36, Sil. VIII 56, Mart. VIII 55, 8, IV 75, 8. St. also uses *Numidae*: II 4, 28.

92-3.: Marble from Thasos, *greco livido*, white with glittering spots: Plin. *Nat.* XXXVI 44-6, Fr. 43 n. 6, Blümner 1884, 35. Sen. *Ep.* 86, 6 complains that it once was rare even in temples and now is used in swimming pools, but how much exaggeration there is in his contention it is difficult to say. It is mentioned also at I 5, 34.

For the name of the island instead of its product: II 6, 66-8n.

Marble from Chios, a variegated kind of marble: Plin. *Nat.* V 136, XXXVI 46, Fr. 68 n. 7, Blümner 1884, 50; it is mentioned also at IV 2, 28, but apparently not elsewhere in poetry.

gaudens fluctus spectare Carystos: Carystian marble is the *cipollino verde ondato*, white with greenish veins which undulate like the sea: Vollm. on I 3, 148, Fr. 24 n. 5, Blümner 1884, 48, *cf.* I 2, 149-50 *concolor alto vena mari*, I 5, 34 *undosa Carystos*, IV 2, 28 *glaucae certantia Doridi saxa*, Mart. Cap. VI 659 *marmore fluctibus concolore.* It is mentioned also at *Th.* VII 370, Luc. V 232, [Tib.] III 3, 14, Sen. *Tro.* 846, Plin. *Nat.* IV 64, XXXVI 48, Mart. X 75, 7, Plin. *Ep.* V 6, 36, see *RE* X 2257.

The parallels indicate, I think, that *spectare* is corrupt. 'The marble is happy to look at the sea, because it equals or surpasses her beauty', is the interpretation of Fr., after Vollm. 'The quarries of Carystos are near the sea, thence the marble looks gladly into the waters': Klotz 1896. Merrill (91), and Törnebladh (53) think that the marble is happy to look at its own colour.

I think, that St., here, as elsewhere, alludes to the resemblance between the marble and the real sea. In this I agree with Vollm. and Fr.,

but I think, with Håk. (58-9), that the text as it stands is too vague for this interpretation.

The only editors who do not read *spectare* are Baehrens, who prints Salmasius' *aequare*, Clouard, who prefers Salmasius' other proposal *certare* (both conjectures were, apparently independently, also made by Heinsius (*caput* 1)), and Saenger who has his own *simulare*.

Of about 10 proposed readings only 3 seem likely, Salmasius' two and Waller's *superare* (19). Salmasius' *certare* is attractive in view of IV 2, 28. But it is not easy palaeographically, and St. avoids the dative of fourth-declension words (Saenger *app.*; *certare* with a dative in St.: Williams on *Th.* X 231): Neue-W. I 541-6 mentions no dat. in *-u* from St., only Verg., Lucr., Ov., Prop., Luc.[29], Sil., [Sen.] *Oct.*, *Anthlat.* For the dat. in *-u* in Vergil, see Norden on *A.* VI 465.

Håk. chooses *aequare*: St. employs it often (e.g. at III 2, 113). Perhaps it imitates here Verg. *A.* III 671 *nec potis Ionios fluctus aequare sequendo.* For colours: Sil. VII 685-6 *concolor aequabat liventia currus equorum/terga.*

I prefer *superare*: it is palaeographically very easy (*super* abbreviated) and has a parallel in I 3, 56 *gaudet humus superatque novis asarota figuris*, see *Th.* VI 843 *superare parem.* If St. really wrote 'and the Carystan marble, enjoying its superiority over the sea', it is a typical climax, as I 5, 40 *vix locus Eurotae*, IV 2, 29 the marble from Carrara is *portandis tantum suffecta columnis* (both ending a catalogue of marbles).

This climax is led up to by *imitatur*: the Laconian marble imitates Nature, the Carystan is superior to it. The superiority of art over nature is implied in 52-62 (n.) and occurs especially in Ov. and Hellenistic poetry, *cf.* Bömer on *Met.* III 158-9, *Met.* II 855-6, X 243 ff., XI 231-6, Grimal 73-4, Drerup 1966, 190 ff.

For the scenery, *cf.* Baudelaire, *Anywhere out of the World* (Petits poèmes en prose): '*Voilà un paysage selon ton goût; un paysage fait avec la lumière et le minéral, et le liquide pour les réfléchir*'.

94.: This verse embraces all the foregoing, harkening back to 84-5 by establishing again the connection between Naples and Pollius' room, but now from the other side (it brings in Naples (84-5)), which turns its face to Naples (*obversa*), saluting it.

Chalcidicus: Neapolitan. In one version of the history of Naples the city was founded by the inhabitants of Cumae, which in its turn was founded from Chalcis in Euboea: Ps.-Scymnus 251, Lutatius Catulus (Peter *Hist. fr.*) I p. 192, Liv. VIII 22, 5, Vell. I 4, 1-2, Plin. *Nat.* III 62. For sources and different traditions: *PP* XXV-XXVII 371-2, 243 ff., Bérard 56 ff., *RE* XVI 2, 2115 ff. St. has it for 'Neapolitan' at IV 4, 78,

[29] But Luc. X 245 *fluctu* is abl.

V 3, 226, for 'Cumaean' at IV 3, 118, V 3, 182. Vergil (*A.* VI 17) is Sts.' forerunner for this second use.

95-7.: The conclusion of both catalogues: Naples is the most important geographical spot for Pollius, Greek the superior culture.

macte animo: 'blessed be your heart and mind'. *Mactus* is probably the past part. of **mago*, to augment. Phrases like *macte virtute* do not occur before Cicero. From religious formulas it entered into poetic usage. The same formula occurs at V 2, 97, *Th.* VII 280, *cf.* III 1, 166 - *animis*, I 3, 106, *cf.* I 5, 63, III 3, 31. St. also uses it with gen., an innovation of the Flavian poets (after *felix*): *macte animi*: *Th.* II 495, *Silv.* V 1, 37, Sil. XV 275, Mart. XII 6, 7: Mulder on *Th.* II, 495, *LHSz.* 69-70, *TLL* VIII 23, 53 ff. also on other usages. For theories on the etymology and construction of *mactus*, see Risch (with further literature).

Macte sometimes introduces the final wish for good health and a long life for Sts.' addressees: I 3, 106, I 5, 63, III 1, 166, see Szelest 1966, 191, Newmyer 100. This role is taken over here by *vivite* (121).

Graia...Graia: Gevaert's palmary correction for M's *grata...grata* ('*Forte rectius legatur Graia*'), accepted by all modern editors. For the same corruption, see II 1, 112-3n. For *Graius*: II 6, 24n. The first *Graia* is used as a noun, the second one belongs to *arva* (see *cura* 71-2). In the first instance St. refers to the marbles, but with *Graia...arva* he extends his meaning.

For the repetition: 68-72n. (*ora*).

Dicarchi moenia: Pozzuoli, the walls of Dicarchus. St. refers to a mythical founder of the city, with a name from which he has formed the adj. *Dicaearcheus*, see 1-3n. Then III 1, 72 *tecta Dicarchei* (= III 5, 75) and IV 8, 7-8 *dilecta...miti/terra Dicarcheo* (Baehr., *Dicachen*: M) offer a problem: either St. uses two names for this founder: *Dicarchus* and *Dicarcheus*, where the second noun is equal to the adj. *Dicarcheus* used in vs. 3, 110, 135 and elsewhere (thus Vollm., Kl., Schamberger 251 n. 1.). Or *Dicarcheus* is an adjective in the three lines above, *viz. oppidi* in III 1 and III 5, *civi* or *conditori* in IV 8 (Fr., followed by Speranza 1956, 43 and n. 50).

Both solutions have their drawbacks, and I think the best solution is Krohn's (in Vollm.) who wrote in III 1 and IV 8 *Dicaearchi* and *Dicaearcho*, thus creating the doublet *Dicarchus/Dicaearchus* which corresponds to the Greek/Latin doublet for the adjective: Δικαίαρχος/*Dicarcheus*, see esp. Fr. 65 n. 3 and *app.* at III 1, 92. Nothing is known about a mythical Dicarchus or Dicaearchus.

For *moenia*, see II 6, 30-3n.

96-7.: 'Pozzuoli does not have to be jealous, we shall make better use of our learned ward'. Pollius has chosen for the Neapolitan citizenship, though he was born in Pozzuoli (see *Intr.* and 133-6n.), thence *alumnus.* Though Pozzuoli is Greek too (the reason why Rinn refused to accept *Graia* in 95), it is a city of commerce and Naples was known not only for its Greek surroundings, but also for its culture, thence *docto*, (119, 152), *cf.* III 5, 81 ff., Ov. *Met.* XV 712 *in otia natam Parthenopen, Laus Pis.* 92 *facunda Neapolis.*

nos: Neapolitans, see *Intr.*, 9-12n.

melius potiemur: 'Possess him with more success', *cf.* e.g. *Th.* XI 192 *melius conubia iungas*, Sen. *Thy.* 638 *animos gravius incertos tenes.*

98-106.: The last item of the description of villa and grounds concentrates on the vine-clad hills, and consists almost exclusively of one mythological scene in two pictures: a Nereid who comes out of the water at night to steal some grapes. The satyrs who run after her. In both scenes the contrast land/water occurs again: *scopulos...rorantia, vindemia fluctu...undas...montani*, and more generally in the Nereid on the land and the satyrs in the water. This is already stressed in the two introducing verses: *ponto...novalia iniecta* and *madidas...rupes.* Likewise these vss. narrow down the interest gradually, from the general *ruris opes* by way of *novalia*, implying culture, to the vineyards: *Baccheo.*

These lines clearly close the description proper: the mythological scene (II 1, 36-136n., II 2, 83-5n.) is of equal length to the '*prooemium*' 36 ff. and with a subject resembling that of 34-5 (n.). But there is no absolute breach between 98-106 and the following, since the praises of Pollius begin by concentrating on the grounds. And correspondences exist: (*arva* 96), *ruris...novalia...tellus* 107, *Baccheo etc....vineta* 111, *saepe...saepe... saepius* 110. And, of course, the last part of the poem translates, as it were, villa and grounds in terms of the owners, see *Intr.*

98-9. Quid...dicam: 64n., 72-5n., *Intr.*, II 1, 96n., II 1, 157-8n.

ruris opes pontoque novalia...iniecta: For the fertile land belonging to the villa: 23 (21-5n.); for the land superimposed on the sea: 52-62n.

novalia: really 'land brought under cultivation for the first time', or on the contrary 'land left fallow'. But in poetry it is often generally 'enclosed land, (cultivated) field': *OLD* 3, e.g. Verg. *Ecl.* 1, 70 *tam culta novalia*, [Quint.] *Decl.* 3, 4 *futuris novalibus eruere silvam.* In St. also: I 4, 129, *Th.* III 645, XII 234.

madidas Baccheo nectare rupes: *Baccheum nectar* is wine. Since Augustan poetry *nectar* can refer to a sweet liquid like honey, milk, wine: *OLD* 2. Honey: III 2, 118. Wine: Verg. *Ecl.* 5, 71, Prop. II 33, 28, Ov. *Met.* I 111.

madidas is a pun. The rocks are wet, but the word means also 'drunk' (*OLD* 6), *cf.* III 1, 41 (Hercules) *multo fratre madentem*, IV 8, 8-9 *plaga cara madenti Surrentina deo*, Tib. II 5, 87 *madidus Baccho*, Mart. I 70, 9. A similar joke occurs at IV 2, 37 *umbravit...sobria rura Lyaeus.*

The vineyards are also mentioned at III 5, 101-2, *cf.* 4-5n.

For the role of Bacchus: 34-5n.

100-6.: A concrete mythological story which fits into the general mythologizing trend of the poem and has a closure-function, *cf.* Cancik 1968, 71, 83-5n. here.

It pictures a Nereid coming out of the water at night to steal some grapes (100-3) and the satyrs pursuing her into the water (104-6). The two scenes are connected because of the 'story' they tell in antithetic detail: the Nereid comes out of her element (lured by Pollius' possessions, *cf.* 19-20) and so do the *montani Panes* (allured by the nymph's attractions). In both cases the last line explains the preceding ones: *rapuit* gives the reason for the Nereid's venture, *cupierunt* for the presence of grapes and Fauns in the sea (see below).

(Demi-) gods often come to visit places at night in St.: I 1, 94-8 Domitian's deified family visits his statue, I 3, 70-4. The Anio himself comes to roll in the moss or swim in the river (!), *cf.* Cancik 1978 n. 65, see also III 1, 144-6: Nereids in the daytime. Geissler (43-4) compares *Culex* 115 ff. *hic* (in Diana's wood) *etiam viridi ludentes Panes in herba et Satyri Dryadesque choros egere puellae Naiadum coetu.* Besides Ovid's stories of nymphs and satyrs (see on II 3), Mart. IX 61, 11 ff. is relevant: a tree within the house: *Saepe* (100, 104) *sub hac madidi luserunt arbore Fauni/terruit et tacitam fistula sera domum;/dumque fugit solos nocturnum Pana per agros,/saepe sub hac latuit rustica fronde Dryas/...hesternisque rubens deiecta est herba coronis, cf.* also Lucr. IV 580-7.

The scene told here is reminiscent mainly of II 3 and is, I think, more sweetish than the other nightly epiphanies in St.

100-4 Saepe: Only here and in 104 to introduce a mythological scene in St., *cf.* Mart. above.

iam pubescente Lyaeo: 'When the grapes are already ripening'. The metonymy *Lyaeus* (4-5n., 34-5n.), *Bacchus etc.* for wine or vine occurs since Hom. *Il.* II 426, *cf.* Lucr. II 656-7 *Bacchi nomine abuti/mavult quam laticis proprium proferre vocamen*, Verg. *G.* II 213, Luc. IX 433 (*Bacchus*, see *OLD* 2a, b), Verg. *G.* II 229, Sil. III 395 (*Lyaeus*, see *OLD* 1 b). In St.: IV 5, 16 *Lyaeus* = wine, *Th.* V 257, X 312, I 6, 95 *Bacchus* = wine, *Th.* VII 308 *Bacchus* = vine.

pubesco is used both for men and for fruit (*OLD* 1, 2) *cf.* II 1, 124-5n. *assurgens.*

noctisque occulta sub umbra: This reminds of Verg. *A.* VI 268 *ibant obscuri sola sub nocte per umbram*, but that can hardly be intentional, in view of the totally different atmosphere here.

palmite...tersit: 'She brushed her dripping eyes with a ripe bough'. *Lumina tersit* was attacked by Ker 3 and at length by Håk. 59-61. Håk. has two arguments 'why would the sea-nymph be troubled by water in her eyes' and 'why should she choose a wine-stem with ripe grapes on it to brush the water away'. Ker proposed *vimina torsit*, Håk. *munera carpsit.*

Concerning the first question I should say that *lumina tersit* is opposed both to the surrounding night (*occulta umbra/lumina*) and to the natural environment of the nymph: in her sea *rorantia lumina* are normal: here water and land are contrasted. *Palmite...rorantia* have the same relation as *vindemia fluctu* (104). I add that in Håkanson's *rorantia munera*, 'the dewy grapes', *rorantia* 'dewy' is unexpected amidst the other words for sea-water (*fluctu, vadis, undam*).

As to the second point, Håk. is right in that Vollmer's explanation is ridiculous: Vollm. claims that the Nereid stoops to pick the grapes directly from the stem with her mouth and brushes the vineleaves with her face. But the Nereid takes, I think, the nearest object, most closely related to the picture as a whole, to brush her eyes. Thus I 2, 92-3 *madentia plumis lumina detersi.* (Amor brushes the eyes of Gallicus), *Th.* VI 7 *pulvereumque fera crinem detersit oliva* (the victor of a contest), see II 7, 105-6n. If 'a vine stem with ripe grapes on it' seems too strange for that, we may also explain *palmite maturo* as 'a vine-shoot taken from a vine with ripe grapes'.

Moreover, both in *vimina torsit* and in *munera carpsit* the reason for the Nereid's coming would already be given, whereas I think that St. postpones this until *rapuit*, see 100-6n. above.

104-6. Saepe...Panes: Commentators again give two diverging interpretations: Vollm. explains *sparsa est vindemia fluctu* as 'the grapes have fallen on the shore near the water', when the nymph flees the pursuing fauns. They themselves fall also into the water, '*im Übereifer*'.

Hardie (157) explains *sparsa vindemia fluctu* as 'the spray from the waves hard by dashes over the vines'. The satyrs plunge into the water and pursue the nymphs. In his interpretation of *vindemia* he is followed by all others (Slater, Clouard, Mozl., Fr., Traglia-Ar., Håk. 61-2). Hardie stands alone, and is wrong, in taking *Dorida* as different from *Nereis* and considering the two scenes as unrelated. The same is true for *cecidere* as 'plunging', see Håk. 62. This must mean 'fell' (inadvertently), as Vollm. says. Håk. and presumably the others, explain 'the spray dashes over the vines. That is when the satyrs fall into the water follow-

ing the Nereid'. *Et* is epexegetical then, as in I 2, 29, *Th.* VI 383, Verg. *A.* XI 272, XII 244 *etc.*

I think that Vollm. is almost completely right here. Håk. (62) claims that to take *sparsa fluctu* as 'sprinkled by the sea' is 'far more natural' than as 'sprinkled in the water', *cf.* III 1, 13 *sparsum pelago montis latus*, III 2, 74 *spargere nubila fluctus*, see for the idea 22-3. On the other hand *spargere* = *dispergere*, 'to scatter', is very common: e.g. *nuces* (Verg. *Ecl.* 8, 30), *flores* (*A.* VI 885), *corpus...undis spargere* (*A.* IV 600-1 with Pease's note). Only the absolute abl. *vicino fluctu* is less natural than the construction with *sparsa*. I rather think the abl. is local without *in* after verbs of motion. 'In St...this construction both occurs more frequently than elsewhere, and is used more boldly': Williams 1951 (*CQ*), 143. For general information on local abl. (with or without *in* after verbs of motion) see Madvig on Cic. *Fin.* V 30 *anulum...in mari abiecerat*, Pease on Verg. *A.* IV 373, for St.: Williams 1951 (*CQ*), e.g. II 1, 101-2, *Th.* II 580-1 *in pectore tela inciderent.* See also on *cecidere* below.

In Håkanson's interpretation the connection between *sparsa* and *cecidere* remains tenuous. In Vollmer's interpretation, however, esp. with *fluctu* as 'in the sea', the link is firm: the Nereid came to the land for grapes, now the grapes have fallen into the water and the satyrs also, who have come for the nymph. The reason for the whole scene 104-6 is postponed until the end, as above.

St. is imitated by Aus. *Mos.* 175 ff. *Saepe etiam mediis furata e collibus uvas/inter Oreidas Panope fluvialis amicas/fugit lascivos paganica numina Faunos.* 182 ff. *Tunc insultantes sua per freta ludere Nymphas/et Satyros mersare vadis rudibusque natandi/per medias exire manus.*

vindemia: 'Grapes', e.g. Verg. *G.* II 89, 522.

cecidere vadis: *Vadis* is dative here. The normal construction of *cadere* is with *in* + acc. In St.: e.g. II 1, 18, II 2, 49, I 3, 73 *in stagna cadit.* The dat. seems the natural equivalent for this (though it is not found with certainty in St.). In some cases St. employs the abl. after *cado* where motion is implied: *Th.* IX 535-6, I 2, 109-10, V 5, 69, *Ach.* I 43-5: Williams 1951 (*CQ*), 144. But it seems reasonable to assume (with Williams n. 8) that wherever the case-ending implies either the dat. of motion or the local abl. (I 5, 49, here, for *intrare* and *subire*: *Th.* I 255, 427, III 385, VI 341, VII 238) the public understood a dative. *TLL* puts the abl. '*qui indicat 'quo' quid cadat*' under *structurae notabiliores* (III 32, 20 ff.), and explains I 5, 49 *unda argento cadit* as a dative (III 17, 1), *cf.* VFl. VIII 189 *undam quae latus in laevum ponti cadit.* It must be conceded that I have not found an unambiguous dative-form after *cadere* in *TLL*. But the regular construction with *in* + acc., varied upon by *quo* (e.g. Ov. *Met.* X 374, Plin. *Nat.* VI 32, 4, Luc. VII 463) implies that the dative of motion, which is frequent in St., is its natural equivalent.

nudam...Dorida: Doris in Latin poetry is the mother of the Nereids and a metonymy for the sea (*Onom.* and Roscher *Lex.* *s.v.*). But St. employs it here as a concrete form of *Nereis*, see *Galatea* in 20. Doris is a given nymph at Hom. *Il.* XVIII 45, Hes. *Theog.* 250, Hyg. *Fab. praef.* 8. In Petr. 126, 18 and in inscriptions *Doris* is a woman's name (*Onom.*). Note that Aus. *Mos.* 176 substitutes *Panope*, the next nymph in Homer's and Hyginus' catalogues (Håk. n. 84), possibly to avoid the confusion which St. may create.

nudam together with *cupierunt*, heightens the eroticism. Scenes where satyrs are pursuing nymphs abound in Latin poetry: II 3, 8 ff., Ov. *Met.* I 699 ff., *Fast.* I 397 ff., Nemes. *Ecl.* 3, 56-7, *cf.* Lucr. IV 580 ff., see *Intr.* II 3. The nymphs are often naked: I 5, 17-8 *veste nihil tectae, quales emergitis altis/fontibus et visu Satyros torquetis amantis*, Ov. *Met.* V 595, 602 *et quia nuda fui, sum visa paratior illi*, XI 237, Mart. X 81, 2, see II 3, 30-1n. Markl. thought *nuda* superfluous and wrote *uda* (see van Dam 390-1), which seems no less superfluous. But *nuda* heightens the tension, gives a better picture, and see *Met.* V 602 above.

montani...Panes: Imitated from Ov. *Ep.* 4, 171 *sic faveant Satyri montanaque numina Panes.* For the mutual identification of *Satyri, Panes, Fauni*: II 3, 8-10n. For the plural *Panes*, already since Aesch. *frg.* 35, see *RE Suppl.* VIII 955, 959, Bömer on *Fast.* I 397 ff., Borgeaud 75 n. 33bis, II 3, 8-10n.

107-54.: The poem ends with praise of the two owners. This can be divided into three parts **1**) 107-120: introductory *topos* and praise of Pollius' poetry, **2**) 121-142: praise of Pollius' philosophical leanings, **3**) 147-146[30], praise of Polla and of the *concordia* between husband and wife. The stress falls on the philosophy, the longest and central part. In the praise of Pollius as a poet 113 points forward to it, the praise of Polla points backward to it (150-4 to 121-2, 148-9 more generally). So does the *concordia* (106-7n., 145n.).

One could also divide into **1**) praise of Pollius: 107-42, much the longest part (almost certainly so, in spite of the lacuna at 147: he is mentioned everywhere in the poem, Polla only at vs. 10, and *cf.* III 3, where only 111-37 are for Etrusca), **2**) 147-53: praise of Polla, **3**) 153-46 praise of the *concordia.* But this seems rather unbalanced. Moreover in 107-8 and 121-2 there is a punctuation by *sis* and *vive* and the use of a mythological allusion. *Tu* (147) stands on one line with *sis* and *vive.*

As has already been pointed out, many points from the introductory vss. and especially of the description proper, are picked up in this last

[30] I keep the, by now traditional, numbering: 141, 142, 147...154, 143, 144, 145, 146, see 147n.

part and given their ultimate (or a second) significance, see esp. 118-20n., 131, 138-42. Szelest (1966, 191) points out that the *encomium* is generally the end of Sts.' poems, but that he also scatters his praise throughout them: 22-3, 26-9, 52-9, 60-3, 81-2. Only in II 3 the praise (of Melior) is concentrated at the end (64-71). In III 3 it is, on the other hand, not taken up at the end.

107-20.: St. takes a fresh start with *sis*. But *tellus* connects this part with the foregoing lines (98-106n.). St. aptly connects this praise of *tellus* with the *topos* 'jealousy of the other possessions' (81-2n.): 107-11. By *hic* (112) he joins this to the most important lines of this section, the praise of Pollius as a poet and philosopher, who is master of nature by his art as well as by his technical achievements (52-62).

107-11. felix: Both 'happy' (122) and 'fertile' (98-9). For the pun on Pollius' name: 21-5n.

dominis ambobus: Pollius and Polla, whose *concordia* (154) is already alluded to. Thus the end of the poem points back to the beginning (9-10) and *concordia* encloses this last section.

domini is used for husband and wife at *Th.* IV 528, Ov. *Met.* VIII 675, *Am.* II 8, 24, Claud. *Rapt. Pros.* II 314, *cf.* Sen. *Her.F.* 805 *uterque dominus* = Pluto and Proserpina.

in annis Mygdonii Pyliique senis: 'Unto the years of Tithonus and Nestor'. St. frequently wishes for a long life for his addressees: I 1, 105, I 2, 276, I 3, 110, I 4, 125 ff., I 5, 64, II 3, 73, III 1, 171, III 4, 104, IV 1, 46, IV 3, 150-2, *cf.* V 3, 256.

Mygdonius is '*Lydius vel Phrygius*': Lact. Plac. on *Th.* II 134. This synecdoche occurs already in Greek poetry: Moschus 2, 98; in Latin: Ov. *Ep.* 15, 142, VFl. III 47, *al.*: Lunderstedt 29, Mulder on *Th.* II 134. Also at V 3, 244.

St. means Tithonus, the husband of Aurora, for whom she asked eternal life, but not eternal youth (Hom. *Il.* XX 237, Hes. *Theog.* 984, Mulder *loc. cit.*). Thus also in *Th.* II (as Lactantius understood). He was proverbial for old age: e.g. Pl. *Men.* 854, Hor. *Carm.* II 16, 30 with Nisbet-H., Prop. II 25, 10, Otto 1890 *s.v.*

Another famous long-lived Trojan (for *Phrygius* = Trojan: II 1, 144-5n.) is Priam. Ellis (1897, 44) and Merrill (92) think that St. here means not Tithonus, but Priam. For his proverbial age, see Otto 1890 *s.v.* In Sen. *Apoc.* 4, 1 l. 14, Mart. II 64, 3, V 58, 4, VI 70, 12, VIII 64, 14, Juv. 6, 326 he is mentioned with Nestor and without Tithonus.

St. mentions Priam and Tithonus together in II 3, 73, V 3, 256, perhaps in III 4, 104 and *Th.* V 75. But in IV 3, 150-2 Nestor, Tithonus

and the Sibylla are coupled. This suggests that in I 4, 125 ff. *Troica... saecula*, where the Sibylla and Nestor follow, Tithonus is meant too.

Priam is not called *Mygdonius* elsewhere (Tithonus: *Th.* II 134) and St. never mentions him separately elsewhere. This strongly suggests that St. means Tithonus here, not Priam.

Nestor from Pylus was also proverbial for old age: (Otto 1890 under *Nestor* 1), in Latin apparently since [Tib.] IV 1, 112. In St.: I 3, 110 *Nestoreae senectae*, I 4, 127, III 4, 104, IV 3, 150, V 3, 255, *Th.* IV 126, V 751 *Pyliae...senectae.* The phrase entered also in rhetoric: Dion. *Techne* 6, 5 ὅτι λιπαρὸν γῆρας κατὰ τὸν Νέστορα ἐβίωσεν, see Lohrisch 105, Vollm. on I 3, 110 (who claim that the poets took it from rhetoric).

nobile...servitium: For the land as a slave, see 52-62n., 74-5n. *Nobile* points already to 101 ff. For the oxymoron, *cf.* II 6, 15-6 *dulce servitium.* Together with *vincat*, which is in the same sphere of meaning, it expresses two wishes: do not take other (less noble) masters and do not let other possessions oust you as a favourite.

Tirynthia...aula Dicarchei...sinus...vineta Galaesi: St. mentions three other possessions of Pollio. He does not name the places where Pollius had possessions, but alludes to them, naming aspects for which they were known.

Tirynthia...aula: 'The temple of Hercules'. For *aula*: III 1, 10 *aula ...Alcidae*, Mart. IX 16, 3. Nohl's *arva* and Baehrens' *ora* miss the point (St. mentions a temple near Pollius' domain, as he mentions the bay surrounding the second one (*sinus*) and the river near the third one (*Galaesus*)) and are unnecessary.

Tirynthius is everything connected with Hercules, e.g. I 3, 79 *templa... Tirynthia*, III 1, 1, 125, Ov. *Met.* VII 410, XII 564 *etc.* For the farfetchedness of these circumscriptions ('The Tirynthian temple' = your possession in Hercules' Tibur), *cf.* 34, 61, II 4, 9-10 *Phaetontia fabula* ('the story about swans'), III 1, 16 *Tyrium plectrum*, V 3, 79 *Haemonius maritus* (her husband, Achilles' son).

In I 3, 79 and in III 1, 183 *Tiburna domus* St. mentions the famous temple of Hercules in Tibur. So we infer that Pollius possessed a domain in Tibur, with most commentators.

Others explain as *Bauli* (Scaliger, Polster 1890, 10, Klotz 1896, Mozl.). There is a story that Hercules rested in Bauli with Geryon's herd (and a faulty etymology βοαύλια): Symm. *Ep.* 1, 1. Therefore Bauli is called *Herculei* at Sil. XII 156. But no temple of Hercules there is known, and Polster's connection of *aula* with *αὔλια is fanciful, nor is there any reason to look (with Klotz) near Surrentum.

Domitius and others (Poliziano, Barth) explain as *Herculaneum*, against which the same can be said as regarding Bauli, apart from the fact that it had been buried under the ashes of Vesuvius for more than 10 years.

Dicarchei...sinus: 'the bay of Naples' (1-3n., for *Dicarchei* 95-7n.). St. probably refers to Limon, *cf.* 81-2n.

Therapnaei vineta Galaesi: 'the vineyards of the Spartan river Galaesus', that is to say Tarentum. *Galaesus* is a river near Tarentum, *cf.* Fr. 69 n. 4, *RE* VII 513 (*Galacum*, see Kleine Pauly under *Galacum*). It is called 'Spartan' because Tarent was a colony of Sparta: Strabo VI 3, 2, Bérard 162 ff., *cf.* III 3, 93 *Lacedaemonii...Galaesi*, Hor. *Carm.* II 6, 10-2 *dulce...Galaesi flumen et regnata...Laconi rura Phalantho* with Nisbet-H.'s note. For the whole expression here: III 3, 93 *Lacedaemonii pecuaria culta Galaesi.* St. employs the same metonymy, 'Spartan' for 'Spartan colony', at III 2, 111 *Therapnaei Canopi*, see Fr. 109 n. 9.

Therapnaeus, 'Spartan', occurs since Ov. (*Ars* III 49, *Ep.* 16, 198, *Fast.* V 223). It comes from Ap. Rhod. II 163. In St. also: *Th.* VII 793, *Silv.* III 2, 11, IV 2, 48, *cf.* II 1, 110-1n., Lunderstedt 26.

Wine from Tarentum (*vineta*) was famous: Hor. *Carm.* II 6, 18-20, Plin. *Nat.* XIV 69, Mart. XIII 125, Marquardt 452.

cultu: according to Vollm., two notions are present in *cultu*, that of living and that of beautifying ('*dass deine Herren häufiger dort wohnen und verschönern*'). He is followed by Mozl. There seems to be only one parallel for *cultus* 'staying', Luc. III 422 *non illum* (*lucum*) *cultu populi propiore frequentant*, where *TLL* (IV 1325, 49-52) remarks '*vide ne sit i.q. habitatio...sim. St. Silv. II 2, 109*'. But in Luc. this notion is implied by *frequentant.* Vollm. takes *cultu* also with *placent*, but this is very improbable. The distance is great and a new clause begins with *nec saepius.* It seems better to take *cultu* here in the same sense as in 41, 'beauty', *amoenitas, élégance* (Fr., Traglia-Ar.), see Håk. 63 n. 86.

nec saepius isti...placent vineta 'may they (Polla and Pollius) not conciliate more often the vineyards'. *Placent* (from *placare*) is kept by most modern editors and explained more or less as above. Saenger and older editors read (after σ) *istis placeant* (*isti placeant*: Slater, *istis placent*: Clouard), defended by Håk. 63.

Håk. objects that *placare* is used only for placating angry or hostile persons by St., and that *placare vineta* is peculiar in general and without parallel in St. For *placeant* I 2, 264-5 is a good parallel: *nec sibi...Lucrinae Naides/nec Pompeiani placeant magis otia Sarni.*

On the other hand, the vineyards can be said to be appeased if they are jealous, as in 81-2 (n.), see *Ach.* I 145 *placanda invidia est.* Nor does Håk. account for *placare* in *Ach.* I 773 *placata fames. Placare* fits better *servitium* and *vincat* than *placere.* I keep M's *placent*, though I am not fully convinced.

isti: II 1, 141-2n.

blanda: 'though they are seductive'.

112-7. Hic...exercet artes, seu...seu...seu...sive...hinc...hinc: Pollius' *Surrentinum* is celebrated, and connected with his literary activities: the stress is on *hic*. When Pollius plies his literary craft here, the Siren and Minerva (and nature: 118-20) come to listen.

112. Pierias exercet...artes: For *exercet*, see Verg. *G.* I 403 *exercet noctua cantus*, Sil. VII 130 *ululatus turba luporum exercet.* For the abstract object, see *Ach.* I 357-8 *exercere...gymnadas.* See *OLD* 7a.

Pierias...artes: *Pierius* means 'connected with the Muses', see 36-42n. under **1**). *Pierias artes* is developed by fourfold *seu.* According to Vollm. (and others, see below), it refers '*im weiteren Sinne*' to philosophy and poetry. But this wider reference is not found elsewhere: in *OLD* all instances refer to literature, most often to poetry. For Horace *Pierii modi* means lyrics (Brink on *Ars* 406). St. means poetry in general with the same words in 42, and *Pierius* is connected with poetry also in I 2, 6 and 107, I 3, 23 *Pierios dies et habentes carmina somnos*, V 3, 45, *Th.* I 3. On the other hand, prose is included in Petr. 5 l. 22 *canore...Ciceronis verba...: Pierio...pectore.*

113. volvit monitus: Translations and Cancik 1968 n. 37, after Kl. 1896 and Vollm., make this refer to philosophic contemplation[31]. But this explanation is proved untenable by *Pierias*, see above. *Volvit monitus* means 'ponders the counsels', but it must refer to a literary activity.

Nisbet (1978, 1) explains it as 'Pollius writes didactic poetry'. This is consistent with the most obvious interpretation of *Pierias* and possible in itself.

On the other hand, it may be assumed that Sts.' references to poetry only begin with *chelyn.* And 114-5 refer to different metre rather than to content, as 113 would do in Nisbet's interpretation.

I rather think that *volvit monitus* refers to writing prose: Pollius composed also in prose (9-12n.). In I 4, 25 ff. St. mentions the fountains of inspiration and continues to speak of prose (*solutis...modis, facundia*) and poetry. Pollius may have been working on a translation of Epicure (for instance the κύριαι δόξαι, *monitus*) or a treatise about his philosophy. This may be supported by Sts.' calling Epicure *auctor*, instead of *senior*, see below.

Other editions (Barth, *ed. Bipontina*, also Clouard) read *sidereas* for *Pierias* in 112 (probably a conjecture by Cruceus). This is obviously wrong, but it shows that someone probably anticipated Vollmer's interpretation of *Pierius* and made Pollius interested in astronomy, philosophy and poetry.

[31] For the importance of contemplating sayings of the poets and philosophers as a psychagogic training, see P. Rabbow, *Seelenführung* (München 1954), 215 ff.

Gargettius auctor: Epicure, born in the Athenian deme Gargettos: Diog. Laert. X 1, Cic. *Fam.* XV 16, 1 *ille Gargettius.* In a similar context St. calls him *senior Gargettius* I 3, 94, *senis-* Mart. VII 69, 3.

114-5. nostram...chelyn...dissona...carmina...ultorem...iambon: 'Whether he plays our lyre or joins unequal poetry or menacingly draws the avenging iambus'.

nostra chelys: hexametric poetry, like mine. *Chelys* for hexameters: I 3, 102, V 5, 33, *Th.* I 33, Nisbet 1978, 1, *cf.* II *Praef.* 28 *hexametros meos.*

quatit: for the lyre; also at *Ach.* II 158.

dissona carmina: elegiacs, unequal because of the lines of unequal length. *Dissonus* in similar contexts refers only to sound, not to metre (*TLL* IV 505, 76 ff.). But the expression can practically suggest only elegy, *versibus impariter iunctis* (Hor. *Ars* 75, where the order also is: hexameters, elegiacs, iambs).

nectere: *Laus. Pis.* 163-4 *carmina...nectere,* Sen. *Ben.* I 4, 5 *dulcem fabulam nectere,* Juv. 7, 18 *nectit...eloquium, OLD* 10.

minax...ultorem...iambon: iambic poetry is called revengeful because of its inventor Archilochus, who allegedly killed his father-in-law with biting satire to revenge himself, *cf.* Hor. *Ars* 79 *Archilochum proprio rabies armavit iambo* and Brink, *Ep.* I 19, 23-6, Tac. *Dial.* 10 *elegorum lascivias et iamborum amaritudinem* and Gudeman, Quint. *Inst.* X 1, 96 (*iambi*) *acerbitas.*

stringit: 'to draw' like a sword: Ov. *Rem.* 377 *stringatur iambus* and e.g. *Th.* X 486 *stricto mucrone,* XI 99.

ultor: as an adj. also at Prop. IV 1, 115, Sil. II 495. For the noun in *-tor/-trix* developing from apposition to quasi-adjective: *LHSz.* 157-8.

St. implies that Pollius is active as a poet. But Schanz-Hosius class him as an orator (9-12n.). Cancik (1978, 121) claims that both he and Vopiscus (I 3, 99 ff.) are rightly excluded there as poets, because they had not yet written literature. This either contradicts what St. says (note the present tenses here and in I 3, 99 ff.) or implies that the disappearance of their work is an indication of its existence or value. Bardon (1956, 231) mentions Vopiscus as a poet, but not Pollius Felix.

116-7. hinc...e scopulis...Siren...hinc...Tritonia: The Siren comes from the *Scopuli Sirenum* (= Verg. *A.* V 864) three rocks in the sea near Sorrento, now called *Galli* (chickens), see 1-3n. and Mingazzini 49 n. 3.

Tritonia listens from the *promunturium Minervae* on the other side of the villa, *cf.* 1-3n. Tritonia is a cult-name of Athena, like Tritogeneia, which relates to a river or lake Triton/Tritonis, *cf.* II *RE* VII^2 244-5. For the confusion as to its origin: Mulder on *Th.* II 722, Williams on X 895, Fr. 15 n. 7 and 87 n. 4. It is extremely common in Latin poetry, since

Catul. 64, 395, see Carter under *Minerva*, 13 times in St., see *Tritonis* in II 7, 28 and *Th.* VII 185.

levis...advolat: Because the Siren is winged: Roscher *Lex.* IV 608 ff., 617 ff.

meliora ad carmina: Better than her own songs. See for the hyperbolic comparison 39-40.

motis cristis: Minerva stays in her temple, silently listening, like the wind and the sea (118-9), nodding her head with the plumed helmet (*cf.* 1-3n.). She is not '*accourue de son temple*' (Fr. 69 n. 8). The Siren, like the dolphins (120), does come.

For *motis*: III 1, 185 *populeaque movens albentia tempora silva*, III 4, 106 *motas aras* with Fr. 124 n. 7.

118-20.: The only sound to be heard is that of Pollius' poetry. All nature becomes quiet: 26n. Pollius is compared implicitly to Arion (on *delphines* below), as he was in 61 for his dominance over nature. Divine intervention is suggested, after 116-7, by *vetantur*: the sea is forbidden to make noise by Neptune.

ponunt: 'Calm down'. This intransitive use of *ponere* occurs only for the winds: Verg. *A.* VII 27, X 103, Ov. *Ep.* 7, 49, *OLD* 9.

rapidi flatus: *Flatus* is 'gale', rather than 'wind': Plin. *Nat.* II 114 *ventos vel potius flatus, OLD* 1b.

rapidus is often used of winds, e.g. Verg. *A.* I 59, VI 75, Ov. *Met.* I 36. It seems to imply 'tearing', 'snatching'.

rapidi is in M, but σ has *rabidi* (not in the *app. critt.* of Phill., Fr., Mar., Sb.). The sound and the passion of *rabidi* are more fitting here than *rapidi*, see 26-7 *insani, furor*, I 3, 20-2 *Anien...tumidam rabiem spumosaque ponit/murmura. Rabidus* is used for the wind at Sen. *Ag.* 484, *rabies* Hor. *Carm.* I 3, 14, Ov. *Met.* V 7, *cf.* III 2, 85 *rabida ora maris*, Verg. *A.* V 802. *rabiem...caeli marisque.* In Hor. *Carm.* I 28, 21 Nisbet-H. choose the neglected reading *rabidus Notus* for *rapidus*. See there for the constant confusion between the two in mss., in St. e.g. at *Th.* IV 777, VII 530, X 823. In III 5, 15 Håk. (95-6) reads *rabidi* for *rapidi.*

I read *rabidi*, with Barth, Markl., Baehr., and Clouard.

maria: Prop., Tib., Hor., and Ov. together have *maria* only three times, against *mare* more than 100, while Verg. has *maria* 16 times and *mare* 25, see Maas 523, who ascribes the avoidance of the plur. to technical refinement, because *maria* must always be elided in hexameters.

St. does not avoid *maria* as much as the other poets: he has *maria* 5 times (*Th.* IV 62, V 342, 704, *Silv.* V 4, 6 and here) and *mare* 12 times (in the *Silv.* II 2, 74 and IV 3, 93). The proportion in the *Silv.* (1:1) and the

epics (3:10) may point to more careful avoidance of *maria* in epic, but the numbers are very small. In fact poets seem to have reacted differently to this 'technical refinement': Luc. indeed has never *maria* and 28 times *mare*. VFl. and Sil. handle the words more or less like St. and Verg.: VFl. 15 *mare*, 5 *maria*, Sil. 12/8.

obstrepere: See 28 *tumultu*, 50-1, 26n. Often used for water: Hor. *Carm.* II 18, 20, III 30, 10, IV 14, 48, Ov. *Fast.* VI 10.

delphines: The dolphins are attracted to Pollius' singing. The ancients claimed that dolphins liked music: Plin. *Nat.* IX 24, XI 137, *RE* IV 2506. This is best illustrated by the famous story of Arion: 60-1n. So St. by implication again closes a section with a '*Mythologem*': 83-5n.

doctam...chelyn: This is a compliment to Pollius (97 *docto*). But it is also an expression of Sts.' own poetic ideal: all poetry worthy of the name is learned, his epics as well as his *Silvae*, see V 3, 215 *non vulgare loqui*, Venini 1969, Aricò 51-2.

doctus had already long ago become a byword for Alexandrian poets and poetry (e.g. Prop. II 34, 89, Ov. *Am.* III 9, 62, Hor. *Ep.* II 1, 56). In Horace and Tib. it is almost a synonym for 'poetic' (Nisbet-H. on *Carm.* I 1, 29, Smith on Tib. IV 6, 2). By transference almost everything connected with the poet or poetry can be called *doctus* (e.g. flute and lyre Prop. II 30, 16 and 34, 79), see Kroll 1924, 37, Brouwers 122-3, *TLL* V^1 1757, 2 ff., II 7, 2-4n.

St. employs it often in this connection: I 2, 50, 172, 259, I 3, 108, II *Praef.* 20-1, II 2, 97, 119, II 7, 3, 12, 46, 76, 83, V 3, 91, 108. That the use was already traditional does not imply that St. uses *doctus* without thinking, see esp. Aricò and Traglia-Ar. 46-7.

blandus: II 1, 45-6n. Here probably 'coaxing for more' (Vollm., *OLD* 1a) rather than 'gently' (Mozl., Fr.) or 'happily' (*festosi*: Traglia-Ar.)[32].

aderrant: *Hapax legomenon.* St. has invented more compound words than simple ones, which is natural. There are more compound words first found in St. than in his contemporaries, 50 in all. They are without exception composed with prepositions, of which *ad* is the most frequent one (14). There is, in this respect, a great difference between the epics and the *Silvae*: In the *Silvae* only six new compound words are found which do not occur in the epics (*adcantare, aderrare, adnubilare, peramare, permerere, pronectere*). Three new compound words occur both in the epics and in the *Silvae* (*adfrangere, inreptare, praelitare*). Forty-one new compound words are found only in the epics.

---

[32] Clouard inadvertently translates '*blancs*'.

In the field of adjectives St. invented 24 words, 2 simple ones and 22 compound ones. Of the compound adjectives 8 do not occur in his epics, the 14 others not in the *Silv.*

For the whole: Schamberger 297-308, 274-5, 285, Speranza 1956, 49 ff., 53, n. 63., *General Intr.* § 4 with note 78[33]. Schamberger claims (297) that the fact that the number of compound verbs in the epics is so much greater must be explained because the *Silvae* were improvised, so that St. had to fall back on trite words. If this is true, another explanation must be found for the adjectives, for there are only somewhat more of them in the *Silv.* than in the epics (which are about three times as long as the *Silvae*).

121-42.: Praise of Pollius' philosophy: the present (or rather his general position) 121-132, the past 133-7, the present again contrasted with it 138-141, with an exhortation for the future at the end 141-2.

Pollius is compared favourably to rich rulers, which also implies praise for his riches (*cf.* 150-3) in 121-5. This is surpassed by praise for his superiority over Fate, which is proved in a comparison of Pollius and all other men: 126-32. That Pollius is superior to others is also the point of 133-7, which, like 121-5, also imply praise for his riches and largesse. The final praise is again (118-20) couched in nautical and natural metaphors, firmly establishing his relation to his house (n.): 138-42.

121-2. Vive: Cancik (*Forschungsbericht* § 4.1) connects this passage, up to the end, together with I 3, 90 ff. and II 3, 62 ff., with the epistolary tradition of Hor. and Mart., with IV 4 and IV 5 as more clear-cut examples. But the *praefationes* seem better examples of a connection with that tradition (II *Praef. Intr.*) and the good wishes or exhortations at the end of Sts.' *consolationes* (II 1, 183-234n.) can be grouped under the same heading as *vive* and the following.

Midae gazis et Lydo ditior auro: Pollius is richer than Midas and Croesus. St. means, of course, that Pollius is wealthy, but before all that he has *potior metallis libertas* (Hor. *Ep.* I 10, 39). For this *topos*, see Hor. *Ep.* I 10, 32-3 *licet sub paupere tecto/reges...vita praecurrere, Ep.* I 12, 6, Man. IV 6-11, Sen. *Ep.* 16, 8, 119, 9 *neminem pecunia divitem fecit,* Motto under *Wealth*, esp. no. 8 ff. St. also praises the way in which his friends use their wealth at II 3, 70-2, 150 ff. here. The transition between wealth in gold and in treasures of the mind is esp. skilfully made by *felix*, both 'rich' (*OLD* 6) and 'happy' (and an allusion to Pollius name, see 21-5n.).

---

[33] Speranza (1956, 49, n. 55, n. 63) adds *excludere* (II *Praef.* 24) to the total of 50, but see note there.

Midas was proverbial for his riches: Catul. 24, 4, Mart. VI 86, 4, Otto 1890 *s.v.* The same goes for Croesus: Catul. 115, 3, [Tib.] IV 1, 198, Prop. II 26, 23, Mart. XI 5, 4, Otto 1890 *s.v.*, *OLD*, Lohrisch 21-2, 25-6, 105-6, 112 ff. They are also coupled at I 3, 105 *digne Midae Croesique bonis et Perside gaza* (= 122, see below). Croesus alone: V 1, 60.

Lydo: Prop. III 5, 17 *Lydus... Croesus.*

gazis: *gaza* is originally a Persian word (Servius on Verg. *A.* II 763) and is often used for royal, especially oriental, wealth, e.g. Hor. *Carm.* I 29, 1-2, Luc. III 165-6, see Austin on Verg. *A.* II 763. Servius (on II 763) is wrong to claim that only the sing. occurs. The plur. occurs e.g. at Lucr. II 37, Hor. *loc. cit.*

Troica et Euphratae supra diademata felix: 'Happier than the rulers of Troy and the Euphrate'.

Troica refers to the wealth of Priam: *Th.* I 161 *Phrygiae...opes* with Heuvel, *Ach.* I 959 *Phrygiae...gazae*, Verg. *A.* I 119, II 503-5, 763-6, V 40, Ov. *Ep.* 8, 14, 15, 177-9, 187-8.

diademata: a diadem, crown, as the sign of royalty, *cf.* III 3, 51 *regum diademata.* Kings are often mentioned as examples of wealth, see Nisbet-H. on Hor. *Carm.* I 4, 13 and 14 and for *diadema* on II 2, 21.

The word is sometimes used as a metonymy for 'power': *Th.* X 801, Hor. *Carm.* II 2, 21, *al.*: *OLD* 1b. Here, however, it is metonymic for 'ruler'. It is not found in this way elsewhere, except, perhaps, for two very late examples: Ennod. *dict.* 2, 8 p. 432, 17 *apostolorum diademata Petrus et Paulus, CE* 1838, 13 *pastor bone, omnium diadema episcoporum*: *TLL* IV 946, 41 ff.

diademata: Q, all editors, *diademate*: M.

Euphratae: 'of Persia': *Th.* VIII 286-90 *Achaemenius...Euphratae*, Verg. *G.* I 509 *Euphrates* = the Parthians, Luc. VIII 358. *TLL* (IV 946, 43) explains as 'Sardanapal', probably thinking of *Babylonis opes* III 2, 137, V 1, 60. But Persia is more probable in this context, see I 3, 105 above.

For the proverbial wealth of Persia: Hor. *Carm.* I 38, 1 and Nisbet-H., III 9, 4 *Persarum rege beatior*, Otto 1890 under *Persa*, Fr. 69 n. 9.

The mss. have *Euphrate*, which all editors explain as *Euphratae*, except for Markl., Queck and Clouard, who prints Gronovius' (1653, *cap.* 20) *Euphrataea.* The adjective *Euphrataeus* does not occur elsewhere, but the gen. *Euphratae* also only occurs at *Th.* VIII 290.

Speranza (1956, n. 51) defends *Euphrataea*: an adj. is demanded by *Troicus.* And St. generally coins a geographic adjective, instead of using the gen. of the noun, e.g. *Amyclaeus* (1, 2, 142, II 1, 111, *al.*), *Aegaeus* (I 3, 95) *etc.* In the rare cases in which he employs the gen. of the noun (I 2, 144, I 6, 13, IV 3, 31), this is because there is already an adjective present (as *fecundis iugis Idymes*). See also II 5, 27-30n.

If Speranza is right, St. scans *sŭpra* here. This is possible, for though he generally has *sūpra* (20 times), he scans *sŭpra* also at IV 2, 30, *Th.* VIII 126, IX 114, *Ach.* II 118.

But in I 5, 39 St. has *Tyri...et Sidonia purpura*, V 1, 26 *Apollineus...Bacchique sacerdos, Th.* IV 426 *piceae cedrique*. For a different kind of variation: II 6, 86, V 1, 60-3, 215-6.

All in all it seems better to read *Euphratae*, instead of introducing a completely new word. Even then the expression is very strained: 'happier than the crowns of the Euphrates' for 'happier than the Persian kings', *cf.* II 1, 175-8n.

123-7.: *Ditior* and *felix* are explained by two relative clauses of different construction: in the first one Pollius is object (*quem*), in the second one subject (*qui*). The first has future tense (*terent*), the second one present (*domas*). It draws a more general conclusion from the concrete *fasces, vulgus, leges, castra.* The whole is summarized by the participial clause *refellens Fortunam.* This again is exemplified by a relative clause like the first one (127-9) with *quem* and future tense.

St. underlines the sense by insistent *non*, see II 1, 56-66n., 128-30n. Repetition of *non*: *Th.* V 307-9 (4 *non*, 1 *nec*), VII 370-1, IX 764-5, X 657-8 (3 *non* in all three), 751-3 (5 *non*), XII 702-3 (3 *non*), Tib. I 3, 47 (3 *non*, 1 *nec*), Ov. *Met.* I 98-9 (4 *non*), XII 622-4 (5 *non*). Somewhat less hectic at II 1, 135 (2 *non*), 139 (2 *non*). It naturally occurs often in the hendecasyllables, e.g. IV 9, 29-36 (5 *non*, 3 *nec*). These repetitions, especially of particles and pronouns, are originally vulgar, but also occur in the high style: *LHSz.* 694-5. Marouzeau (1949, 185 ff., where he develops his ideas of 1935, 255 ff.) has demonstrated both the preponderance of the 'negative style' over the 'positive style' in general, and the excessive use of negation in Lucan.

quem...terent: 'Neither a career in politics (*fasces, vulgus*), nor one as a lawyer (*leges*) or as a soldier (*castra*), will use up your forces'.

The drawbacks of politics are the uncertainty of power, *ambigui fasces*, and the fickleness of the crowd, *mobile vulgus.* See I 4, 40 *ignarae plebis, Th.* V 147-8 *varius fremor et...dissensus, ut plebe solet*, XI 102-3 *anceps vulgus*, Lucr. III 996 *petere a populo fascis saevasque secures*, Hor. *Carm.* I 1, 7 *mobilium turba Quiritium*, Sen. *Her.F.* 170 (26n.), Otto 1890 under *vulgus*, already in Demosth. 19, 136, see 133-7n. below.

The general idea of retirement is Epicurean, see 26-9n. and 26n. (also for other reasons of retirement than Epicureanism) and Usener pp. 94-96, *frg.* 552, 556, 564, 580, esp. 548 τὸ εὔδαιμον καὶ μακάριον οὐ χρημάτων πλῆθος οὐδὲ πραγμάτων ὄγκος οὔτ' ἀρχαί τινες ἔχουσιν οὐδὲ δυνάμεις, Bailey on Lucr. II 11 and V 1105-35, Vollm.

leges and *castra* are coupled also at I 1, 28, I 2, 267.

terent: M, *tenent* σ, read by Klotz 1896. This is unnecessary: Liv. VI 6, 27 *in armis terant plebem*, Plin. *Ep.* II 3, 5 *nos qui in foro verisque litibus terimur*, X 12, 3. *Tero* stresses the unhappy life of others, see Usener *frg.* 565-6 πανηγυριεῖν δὲ οὐδὲ ῥητορεύσειν καλῶς. The future tense here, because this will never happen, owing to Pollius' character (thence *domas* present tense).

pectore magno: I 1, 41 *pectora quae mundi valeant evolvere curas, Ach.* I 226, Sen. *Suas.* 1, 3 *magni pectoris est inter secunda moderatio*, Sen. *Dial.* IV 6, 1 *ira...angusti pectoris est, OLD* 4a.

spemque metumque domas: Pollius is not subject to hope or fear, immune for the future. This makes him a real wise man or king: Sen. *Ep.* 85, 40 *sapiens artifex est domandi mala, Thy.* 348 ff., 388-9 *rex est qui metuit nihil, rex est qui cupiet nihil*, see *Dial.* II 5, 2, *Ep.* 13, 16 and 80, 5, Cic. *Fin.* I 41, 43, 49, *al.*

spes and *metus* are often coupled, not only in ethics (e.g. Sen. *Ep.* 13, 12-3, *Dial.* II above), but also in poetry: Verg. *A.* I 218, Luc. VI 419, VII 211, VFl. VII 192, Coripp. *Ioh.* III 154, *Anth.Lat.* 8, 67, also Liv. XLII 59, 8, Tac. *Hist.* II 2, 1.

On *-que...-que*: II 1, 220-2n., II 6, 54-5n.

domas: Pollius tames his passions like he tames nature: 52-6n.

voto sublimior omni: M has *tuto*, Waller (20) corrected to *voto*, comparing Rut. Nam. I 163 *voto sublimior omni* and pointing to *optare* 130 here.

votum 'a wish', a variation on *spem*, see *Th.* I 322-3 *spes...anxia...longo ...voto.* For wishes as unfitting for the *sapiens*, see Sen. *Ep.* 31, 5 and 72, 7 *omnia vota mortalium nullum in beata vita habere momentum*, 121-4.

It is accepted by all editors except for Saenger, and far superior to other proposals (*cura*: Krohn in Vollm., *vitio*: Domitius, *motu*: Polster 1884, *astu*: Baehrens, *titulo*: Grasberger in 1877, McNaghten in 1891, Adrian in 1893, *fuco*: Saenger, *tupho*: Rostagni 1933[34]). The corruption probably went *voto* <*toto* <*tōto* <*tuto* (Fr. *app.*).

exemptus fatis: II 1, 222, Sen. *Tro.* 977 *Cassandra...quam furor sorti eximit.*

refelles: M, *refellens* Markland (*refellis*: Q, *repellis*: σ, see Saenger *app.*). A part. is needed, on one line with *exemptus*, which otherwise would be constructed with (*es*). All editors from Klotz (1896) onwards accept Markland's conjecture. More details: van Dam 391.

indignantem...refellens Fortunam: 'Repudiating indignant Fortune'. The phrase is well illustrated by Mulder on *Th.* II 177 *quantumque*

[34] This is the only conjecture recorded by Mar. in his *app.* The disadvantages of an obstinate adherence to the *ductus litterarum* could not be demonstrated better.

ferentem/fortunam virtute domas, who explains '*Fortunae vim, quae felicitatem afferre multis videtur, refellit* (sc. *Adrastus*), *ita ut Fortuna indignetur*'. That is to say: though Fortune can bring many good things, the wise man Pollius does not wish to serve her, which angers Fortune (Barth: '*quia ei non subiaces*').

This means that the *topos* alluded to here is *not* 'the enmity of Fortune' (II 1, 120-4n., II 6, 68-70n.), as Mozl. translates, and Vollm. implies by some of his parallels (Hor. *S.* II 7, 88, Cic. *Fin.* I 46).

St. means: 'the wise man rebuts Fortune': Usener *frg.* 584 τύχῃ τε (τὸν σοφὸν 'Επίκουρος) δοκεῖ ἀντιτάξεσθαι, Cic. *Tusc.* III 49, V 104 ff., Sen. *Ep.* 51, 9 *libertas nulli rei servire* (130 here), *nulli necessitati, nullis casibus* (131), *fortunam in aequum deducere*, 71, 34 and 72, 8, Claud. *Epith. Pall.* 80-1 *doluit Fortuna minorem se confessa viro, Paneg. Prob. et Ol.* 38-9 *virtutibus ille fortunam domuit*, Nisbet 1978, 2.

On the personification of *Fortuna*: II 1, 120-4n., II 6, 8-9n., 66-8n.

127-9.: Pollius will not be surprised by death. *Deprendet* and *dubio in turbine* reinforce each other and are opposed to *abire paratum* and *plenum vita.* The general thought of not being afraid to die (II 1, 222-6 with the same contrast with *nos*, Diog. Laert. X 124, Cic. *Tusc.* I 62, Usener *frgg.* 496-503) is clothed in Epicurean terms.

dubio...in turbine rerum: 'The uncertain whirlwind of things'. *Turbine rerum*, also at *Th.* III 251, maybe an imitation of Ov. *Met.* VII 614 *attonitus tanto miserarum turbine rerum*, see *Am.* II 9, 2 *miserae turbine mentis.* It is the same as *caligo* 138, *cf.* II 1, 221 *dubios casus*, II 3, 68 *tumultus*, Hor. *Ep.* I 18, 110, *dubiae spe pendulus horae.* Sen. *Thy.* 621 *res deus nostras celeri citatas turbine versat*, Luc. II 243 *quam turbine nullo excutiet fortuna tibi*, Claud. *Ruf.* I 260 *medio de turbine rerum, cf. Ruf.* II 90. This shows that Pontanus' *dubium* (*Analecta* II *cap.* 13, ascribed to Markl. by Baehr., Vollm. and Postg.) is unnecessary.

deprendet: 'To surprise' (*OLD* 2a), perhaps also with the connotation 'to swoop down on', as II 6, 33 (*OLD* 1). The contraction of *deprehendere* is usual in prose and poetry: Quint. *Inst.* IX 4, 59 *utrum volet sumat compositio...deprehendere vel deprendere.* St. invariably (22 times) has the contracted form.

suprema dies: II 1, 222-6n.

abire paratum ac plenum vita: An imitation of Lucr. III 938 *ut plenus vitae conviva recedis*, also Hor. *S.* I 1, 118 *vita cedat ut conviva satur, Ep.* II 2, 214. The comparison is Epicurean: Stob. *Flor.* V 67, Cic. *Tusc.* V 118, Usener *frg.* 499 (19n.). But its origin may well be popular wisdom rather than Epicurean orthodoxy, see Kenney on Lucr. III 138. Note that St. has cut out a reference to dining, compressing the metaphor.

Vollmer's suggestion that St. also thinks of another Epicurean comparison, to leave life like a theatre, full of satisfaction (Usener *frg.* 397 note on l. 19, Cic. *Fin.* I 49) is unfounded.

abire: used by St. because it is also in Hor. *Ep. loc. cit.*, but it also means 'to die': *Epic. Drusi* 238, 298, *OLD* 5, II 1, 218-9n.

paratum: with inf. since Lucr. VI 564, also in Luc., VFl., Juv., see 230 below and *Th.* III 668: Clement, *LHSz.* 350.

129-32.: Comparison of Pollius to lesser mortals: *nos/tu, vilis/magno* (124), *caducis deservire bonis/non terent* (124), *cf.* 72 *semper...tuus, optare/spem domas* (125), *casus/fatis* (126), *Fortunam* (127). This culminates in the picture of Pollius as the Epicurean sage in 131-2.

vilis turba: *Th.* 191-2 *nos, vilis...manus*, V 120 *vilis turba*, Verg. *A.* XI 372, Sen. *Tro.* 80, Luc. V 683.

caducis...bonis: II 1, 212-3n., Man. IV 403 *pudeat tanta bona velle caduca.*

semper...optare parati: *Semper* with *optare* rather than with *parati.* Note the pointed contrast between *optare parati* and *abire paratum* 128.

optare: absolute, see Sen. *Ep.* 117, 24 *hic mortis est fructus, optare desinere, Ben.* VI 25, 5.

celsa...rides: Pollius as the *sapiens*, an imitation of Lucr. II 1 ff. *suave mari magno turbantibus aequora ventis/e terra magnum alterius spectare laborem etc.* Up to 18 there, many concepts occur which are found in this section: *bene...munita...edita...templa...despicere unde queas alios...videre errare...niti... rerum potiri* (121-3). *O miseras hominum mentes...qualibus in tenebris vitae...mente fruatur...cura semota metuque.*

The *arx* as a symbol for a refuge from the world's follies is old and popular, since Empedocles 4, 8 σοφίης ἐπ' ἄχροισι θοάζειν: Hor. *Carm.* II 6, 21 with Nisbet-H., e.g. *Ciris* 14 *si me iam summa sapientia pangeret arce... unde hominum errores...despicere atque humiles possem contemnere curas*, Sen. *Ep.* 82, 5, *Thy.* 365, Claud. *Carm.* 17, 6 *ex alta mortalia despicit arce*, see also Nisbet 1978, 2 (Vollmer's parallels are less trustworthy).

St. hyperbolically makes Pollius *gaudia ridere* instead of *errores.* This seems to make him more human than Lucretius' sage, but also more superior. These joys are the τῶν ἀσώτων ἡδονὰς καὶ ἐν ἀπόλαυσει κειμένας (Diog. Laert. X 131), not the real Epicurean ἡδονή. Markland's *grandia* completely misses the point.

despicis: 'Look down with disdain': II 7, 110, *OLD* 2a. It reminds again of Pollius high in his villa: 3, 83, 93, *cf.* III 1, 105, 137.

mentis ab arce: Sen. *Ep.* 82, 5 *animus...arce se sua vindicat, Carm. de albo et nigro* 32 (*Poet. Min.* V p. 374) *volves mentis in arce dolos*, Sid. *Carm.* 2, 173 *Platonis ingenium... in arce fuit.*

133-9. Tempus erat...At nunc: Pollius' former life as a politician is contrasted to his blessed retirement. His former behaviour is opposed to his present life by *at nunc*, but also by *celsus* (134) against *celsa* (131): in his youth he was *celsus* in the wrong sense. Pollius' earlier life is that of others now, and St. goes on to contrast the others again to Pollius: *alii* (139), *nostras* (142)/ *tua* (140).

Pollius' fundamental error was being in politics and this is emphasized by the political vocabulary: *suffragia* (133), *colonis* (135), *largus* (136). His activity was even worse because it concerned two cities, *duas...urbes* (134). But at the same time this enables St. to pay a compliment to Pollius for his, from an orthodox philosophic point of view wrong, popularity and generosity. In the background is the thought 'you were right in choosing for Epicureanism (or philosophy), but also in choosing for Naples', *cf.* 96-7.

Tempus erat: This is a formula, mainly used in epic poetry, e.g. Verg. *A.* II 268, Ov. *Met.* VI 587, X 446, *Fast.* V 497; in St.: *Th.* IV 680, VIII 271, *Silv.* III 1, 52. But in all those cases it denotes a time of the day. A better parallel is the use of *tempus erit*, generally introducing a prophecy: *Th.* I 32, XII 408, Tib. I 4, 79, Ov. *Met.* XIV 147, *cf. Silv.* V 1, 135 *tempus nunc ponere frondes*, V 5, 43 *nunc tempus, amici.* The formula is no proof that St. imitates Vergil, as stated by Luehr (8, with a jumble of vaguely similar combinations).

geminae suffragia terrae: 'The votes of two cities', *viz.* Pozzuoli (= *Dicarcheis colonis*, see 3, 96-7n., *Intr.* under **IV**) and Naples (*meis*, 72-97n., *Intr.* under **IV**). Varied upon by *duas urbes.*

geminae: For 'two' or 'both', since Neoteric poetry: Catul. 63, 75 *geminas aures* = IV 4, 26. St. has it often in the *Silv.*: I 2, 240, I 3, 2, 64, II 2, 17, 24, II 7, 21, III 1, 101, V 3, 125. For the epics: Fortgens on *Th.* VI 118 and Williams on *Th.* X 841. In general: Norden on *A.* VI 788, *OLD* 4.

diriperent: 'To compete for the favour of': *OLD* 2b, see *Th.* V 722, Mart. VII 76, 1, *al.*

celsus veherere: Carried in a litter. *Celsus* is both literal and refers to rank, *cf.* I 4, 42 *celsus eques*, III 3, 145.

The nom. *celsus* alternates with 2 vocatives: *venerande, adscite.* Similarly: II 5, 4, *Th.* II 103 *iners...secure iaces* (Mulder there), Verg. *A.* X 324-6 *stratus...securus...miserande iaceres.* The construction is already found in Hor., Prop., Ov. and betrays Greek influence: Löfstedt, 1942[2], 96 ff.

For *veherere*, see II 1, 48-9n.

Dicarcheis...colonis: Pozzuoli was a Roman colony since 194 B.C.: Strabo V 4, 6, Plin. *Nat.* III 61. For the adj. see 1-3n., 95-7n.

Out of *colonis* something like *civibus* must be thought with *meis.* Similarly III 5, 78 *propriis tenuis* (*civibus*) *nec rara colonis.*

adscite: Pollius is 'adopted' by Naples. That is to say, he was a magistrate in both cities (*suffragia, celsus*), donating statues, games *etc.* to them both, *cf.* III 1, 91-3 *largitor opum qui...tecta Dicaearchi pariter iuvenemque replesti Parthenopen*, IV 8, 6-8, Fr. 70 n. 2.

On Sts.' use of *adsciscere*: II 1, 82-6n.

Two cities competing for someone's favour occur also at V 3, 124 ff. (Sts.' father born in Hyele but at home in Naples). It is somewhat of a literary *topos*: the cities claiming that Homer was born there, or Alcman (*Anth. Gr.* III 25), *cf.* Hor. *S.* II 1, 34, Aus. *Epic. patr.* 4.

iuvenile calens: 'With youthful fire'. For *calere* and youth, see e.g. Ov. *Ars* III 571 *pueros aetate calentes*, Hor. *Carm.* III 14, 27, Sen. *Cl.* I 11, 1 *in adulescentia caluit*, III 9, 1, Luc. II 324, Juv. 6, 369, Eyben 1977, 103 n. 53, *cf. Ach.* I 277 *ignis iuventae, OLD* 7a. The adv. acc. does not occur with it in Verg., Tib., Prop., Ov.: Priess, nor elsewhere in St. *TLL* (III 148, 7 ff.) gives no other instances of it.

For other adverbial accusatives: II 1, 222-6n.

plectri...errore superbus: Thus M and the other mss. This is a *locus conclamatus*, see Håk. 64-6 and for some additions van Dam 391. The text is kept by all editors from Baehr. onwards, except for Saenger and Postg. Their explanations of it, however, diverge widely.

One group of critics understands *plectri errore* as referring to Pollius' poetry, and concludes that in his youth Pollius wrote verse which was different from that for which he is praised in 114 ff., *nugae*, light poetry: Klotz *ed.*, Fr. 70 n. 3, Traglia-Ar. 800 n. 137. Fr. quotes Aus. 324, 109 (P.) *errorem meum* 'my poetry about Cupid'. *TLL* (V^2 818, 61-4) quotes our line and Aus. as the only instances of *error* referring to poetry and accepts the explanation of Klotz (see *ibid.* 817, 84).

Vollm. understands that Pollius now writes poetry at home, whereas in his youth he went from one hall to the other to declaim it (*error*). This interpretation of *error*, wandering to different cities, or between Naples and Pozzuoli, is shared by Ellis (1897, 46) and Mozl.

Mozl. and Slater also think that *plectri error* refers to Pollius' versatility as a poet.

Gevaert and the *ed. Bipontina* referred *error* to the dancing or turning of lyric poets in reciting and Kl. 1896 (48) thought that *plectri errore superbus* means that Pollius was made proud by other poets praising him.

I agree with Håk. that it is most improbable that St., after his praise of Pollius' poetry in 114 ff., could criticize it here in any way whatsoever. If Pollius really minded Epicure's ποιήματα δὲ ἐνεργείᾳ οὐκ ἂν ποιῆσαι (Usener *frg.* 568, quoted by Vollm.), St. could not mention his poetry in 114 ff. The phrase could seem to be saved by explaining 'proud about the wandering of your plectrum over the strings' and claiming that

Pollius' plectrum still wanders but that his pride has disappeared. But this needs much reading into the text, and I think *error* must inevitably remind of *errantes* 132. On whatever explanation, it is unexpected and very strange that, while discussing Pollius' political ambitions, St. should devote three cryptic words to his literary leanings.

It seems that the passage is corrupt, and the corruption must be in *plectri*. *Error* is protected by *errantes* and *verum* (138) (see also Cic. *Div.* 45 *qui error, quae tenebrae*) and *caligine* in 138 (Håk. 66). This disposes of Markland's *decore* and Saenger's *plectris quoque et ore*.

For *plectri* Markl. suggested *aevi*, Madvig (2, 158) and Postg. *patriae* (Postg. reads *plectrique his largus et illis...patriae errore superbus*. This is ingenious, but does not explain why Pollius' poetry is mentioned at all). Rothstein (1900, 510 ff.) conjectured *sceptri*, Otto (1887, 533) *populi*. Håk. himself (66) *pulchri* and Courtney (1971, 95) *recti*.

Håk. and Courtney explain *pulchri/recti errore superbus* as 'magnificent, even in your misconception of the good'. For the gen.: Tac. *Hist.* II 72 *vulgus...errore veri*, Cic. *Tusc.* V 42 *in bonorum...errore*. Courtney's *recti* is superior to *pulchri*, see V 3, 248 *amor recti*, *Th.* II 360 *rectum terris defendere*.

I should explain Otto's *populi errore superbus* as 'proud, because the people (of two cities) were so misled as to acclaim him', or 'feeling high and mighty owing to the wayward ways of the crowd'[35]. Håk. says that *superbus* cannot be negative, and should be explained as 'magnificent'. But I think that if *error* does not refer to Pollius anymore, but to the *populus*, the *errantes*, then he himself may be blamed for having been *superbus*, as it were *celsus* in the wrong sense again.

Rather than *populi* I would write *plebisque*, the common man, *cf.* I 4, 40 *ignarae plebis*, I 5, 47 *nil ibi plebeium*, 123 here *mobile vulgus*, *Th.* V 147-8 *varius fremor aut studia in contraria rapti/dissensus, ut plebe solet*, VI 560 *varii...ignorantia vulgi*, *Ciris* 2 *fallacis praemia vulgi*. Then *error* points back to *errantes*, but not because Pollius is said explicitly to have been erring. And *superbus* in a way corresponds to *despicis* (132).

I think Courtney's *rectique errore*, inspired by Håk., very good, but I prefer *plebisque errore*.

Ac: M, *At*: σ, all editors, *cf.* II 4, 8 *at nunc*.

discussa rerum caligine: *Caligo* is 'moral or intellectual darkness': *OLD* 7a, e.g. Catul. 64, 207, Sen. *Dial.* X 13, 7, Juv. 6, 613, see Mulder on *Th.* II 685, Dilke on *Ach.* II 149. *Discutio* is also combined with it at Verg. *A.* XII 699 *discussae umbrae et lux reddita menti*, see *OLD* 2a.

---

[35] Courtney translates as 'made proud by the dispute about your citizenship'. This is not an obvious interpretation of *error populi* nor, I think, what Otto meant by it. Rothstein explains his own *sceptri* more or less in Courtney's way.

rerum: a similar 'superfluous' *rerum* as in 127 above, see *Th.* II 263 *omina rerum*, III 251 *varios rerum tumultus*, 548 *cuncta rerum*, VI 243, X 178. For the jingle *rerum...verum*, see *ora* and II 1, 69-72n.

139-42.: St. says that Pollius' ship has safely arrived in the harbour where it must stay, and that others, St. for instance, are still tossed on the high sea.

He fuses two metaphors: Epicurus speaks of the quiet of the mind as that of a haven: τἀγαθὸν ἐν τῷ βαθυτάτῳ τῆς ἡσυχίας ὥσπερ ἐν ἀκλύστῳ λιμένι καὶ κωφῷ (Usener *frg.* 544), γαληνία (425), Cic. *Tusc.* V 6, 16 *ut maris igitur tranquillitas...nulla...aura fluctus commovente, sic animi quietus et placatus status.* This is *securos portus* here.

This metaphor has many ramifications: the storm of the soul (Diog. Laert. X 128, Usener *frg.* 413, 457, *cf.* Schrijvers 1970, 272) and the haven of philosophy (Verg. *Cat.* 5, 8-9), see *RLAC* V 722 ff., and for *placidam quietem* also 26n.

The other metaphor is one which St. likes: the ship that reaches the harbour, after an undertaking which is finished: IV 9, 88-9, *Th.* XII 865 (both for Sts.' *Thebais*), I 2, 202-3, II 1, 67-9n.

One could compare the common metaphor of 'the ship of state' (Nisbet-H.'s *Intr.* on Hor. *Carm.* I 14) and also the figurative use of *altum* as in Lucr. V 1434 (but see Bailey's note), *cf.* Sen. *Dial.* VII 17, 4 *in alto vitiorum omnium sum, OLD* 1b. *Illo alto* is 'this peril', *viz.* politics.

et: M, *sed*: Postg., followed by Phill. and Housman (1906, 42), *cum*: Saenger, *at*: Havet (179). But this *et* indicating a contrast, that is, instead of *cum inversum* is not uncommon. Fr. *app.* gives some examples of it, most of which have a temporal clause in the protasis, like Verg. *G.* II 80 *nec longum tempus, et.* As *LHSz.* (481) say, it is less striking without this temporal clause, e.g. Verg. *A.* II 705 *dixerat...et iam...auditur*, Prop. II 29, 33, Ov. *Fast.* VI 384, Luc. I 231, see *TLL* VI 895, 53-8, 872, 71-6. This use of *et* occurs since Verg. in poetry and Livy in prose. Comparable in St. is III 2, 127-9 *ergo erit illa dies...ac.*

et and *intravit* show that Barth's *iactentur* is wrong: St. speaks about a real and unalterable state of affairs.

perge: Present (*iactantur*), past (*intravit*) and a warning for the future.

in nostras puppem dimitte procellas: 'Send your ship into the storms which toss us'.

Dimittere: to let sail from port: VFl. VII 260-2 *vatem...nunquam dimittere portu vellet. Demitte*: (A, *demittere*: M, *dimitte*: ς) means 'to let into the water' as II 6, 28. On the frequent confusion between *de-* and *dimittere*, see II 4, 18n.

emeritam...puppem: 'The ship that has served out its time'. The perf. part. occurs often in this sense, frequently transferred: *OLD* 1c, III 1, 58. Pollius' ship is unscathed, *non quassa* (141). *Puppis* varies on *ratis.*

143 ff.: In all mss. *procellas* is followed by *Discite securi, quorum de pectore mixtae...praecedite famae*, the 4 lines which are numbered 143-6 here, but transposed to the end of the poem.

They were transposed by Antonius Amiternus (died 1512). This was defended by Gronovius (1653, 184 ff.) and Vollm. on the following grounds: the plur. *discite* is very strange after the praise of Pollius alone, and the more so if the praise of Polla comes after it. *Tuque nurus inter* (147 ff.) fits badly after 145-6 *ite per annos etc.*, but very well after *perge...procellas. Ite* is an apt conclusion to the poem (a wish, like *persta* II 3, 73, *cf.* I 3, 108-10, I 5, 65-6 *tecum ista senescant*, the end of I 1, I 4, III 4, IV 3, V 1). As Fr. points out, *discite* follows logically on *docuit* (154) and is strange after *procellas.*

Though the cause of the corruption is not clear (see 147n.), the lines must be replaced. The only editors not to do so are Markl. and Baehr.

147. Tuque nurus inter longae praecordia curae/non frontem vertere minae: This is in M. It is meaningless. Domitius put forward two different proposals: to read *cuius* for *longae*, which is extremely improbable from a palaeographic point of view, but makes some sense (van Dam n. 34). His other suggestion was to suppose a lacuna between *longae*, or rather *longe*, and *praecordia.*

This lacuna is accepted by all editors[36]. Some proposals have been made for filling it *exempli gratia.* They all agree in explaining *longae* as *longe* and in supposing a superlative notion following it: *nitidissima Polla*: Sudhaus (in Vollm.), *pulcerrima*: Buecheler (*ibid.*), *doctissima* (Vollm.), *praesignis*: Saenger, *praedocta*: Hardie (58).

To suppose that *prae-...praecordia* caused the scribe to skip part of the sentence seems more probable than that *longe* occurred twice as in Vollmer's *longe doctissima...longe praecordia curae* (meaning *longe praecordia absunt a cura*, not a convincing solution). *Praedocta*, moreover, seems suggested by *docuit* 154, *discite* 143, see *docto* 97, *docta* 152. That Polla is in all respects like Pollius is likely to have been said in these lines *cf.* 153-4 and below, and supposed by Vollm. and Hardie.

Hardie's proposal is the one most often quoted in *app. critt.* and easily the best suggestion: *tuque nurus inter longe* (*praedocta Latinas, parque viro mentem, cui non*) *praecordia curae...vertere. Praedocta* occurs also at V 3, 3. It is

[36] Clouard leaves out *tuque nurus inter longe* and prints a lacuna between *procella* and *praecordia.*

a compound created by St. (Schamberger 289, Mulder on *Th.* II 297). *Latinas* is very good: there are only two instances in St. where *nurus* means: 'woman', here and at II 6, 25 (n.) *Latinae...nurus.* For the adj. *cf.* also Sid. *Carm.* 22, 195 *qua non ulla magis nurus unquam Pontia gaudet.* It has also the merit of not mentioning Polla's name: she is already mentioned at the outset, see II 1, 1-3n., 52-4n., 102-5n., 166-8n., 227-30n. Vollm., Sudhaus and Klotz 1896 have *Polla* somewhere in the lacuna.

This is not to say that it is certain that St. wrote exactly this. For one thing, the lacuna may have been longer than one line. But it seems that he could very well have written what Hardie suggests he did.

For some more details: van Dam 392-3.

147-9. praecordia curae: For similar endings, see *Th.* IX 179 *praecordia luctu, pectora curae*: II 1, 69-72n., 191-3n. For *curae* here: 68-72n.

Polla is praised for two things: her imperturbability (ἀταραξία) and her handling of their money. The first is *praecordia...voluptas* (147-9). The second quality is praised in 150-3. The point which is made throughout is her unanimity with her husband: *curae, curarum*/ 71 *curae*; *non minae, gaudia, voluptas*/ 122 *felix* (see *infelix* in 150), 132 *rides*; *docta*/ 97 *docto*, 119 *doctam*, 152 *docta*; *torquent*/ 124 *terent* and in 153-4 *Concordia.*

non frontem vertere minae: *Vestere*: M, *vertere*: Poliziano (*cf.* van Dam 392), *cf.* Hor. *S.* II 8, 35 *vertere pallor...faciem, Epod.* 4, 9 *ora vertet indignatio.*

minae: menacing, angry looks: *Th.* I 188 *gerit ore minas* IX 704-5 *severis asperat ora minis*, Sen. *Her.F.* 329 *minas vultu gerens*, Val. Max. III 8, 6, Sil. II 208, *TLL* VIII 992, 49 ff., 68 ff.

frons is mentioned as the index of Polla's mood or character, see II 1, 43n. Nisbet (1978, 8), who thinks that Polla is identical with Lucan's widow Polla Argentaria (II 7 *Intr.*, 150-3n. below), has a different explanation: *frontem vertere minae* means 'the way in which she was threatened in the Pisonian conspiracy by her interlocutors has not changed her mien'. In other words, she kept *idem semper voltus eademque frons.* Apart from the correctness of the identification (and even then we do not know that Lucan's wife was considered as an accomplice by Nero), this is improbable: *frontem...minae* corresponds to *in vultu...voluptas.* (For *frons* alternating with *vultus*, see II 1, 43n. and many instances in Otto quoted there). It is equivalent to *altam frontem et nubila vultus* (III 5, 11), *frons triste rigens* (V 1, 64) and opposed to *serena fronte* (I 3, 91-2, II 6, 66, *cf.* Hor. *Carm.* I 37, 26 *voltu sereno* and Nisbet-H.), *placida fronte* (III 4, 17), *frons tranquilla* (V 2, 73), Pease on Verg. *A.* IV 477.

candida...gaudia et...curarum ignara voluptas: *Gaudia* and *voluptas* both go with *in vultu.* They refer to ἡδονή, the goal of Epicureanism, while *curarum* is ταραχῶν, disturbances.

candida gaudia: 'bright joy' (*OLD candidus* 7b): Prud. *Psych.* 901, *cf. Paneg. Lat.* IV (X) 1, 2-3 *in vultu cuiusque hilaritatis publicae decus et in serenis frontibus animorum indicia...(laetitia) candida.* Markland's *gratia* (*'fere persuadeor'*) is unnecessary.

For *curarum* after *curae*: 68-72n.; for conjectures: van Dam 392.

150-3. non...strangulat...torquent...temperies: Pollius and Polla were rich: 136 *largus*, III 1, 91 ff., 166 *opibus*, IV 8, 57 *nitorem*, the construction of the villa and its surroundings. Epicureanism (or Stoicism: Sen. *Ep.* 94, 72, 119, 9, *Dial.* VII 26, 1 *etc.*) did not tolerate luxury: Sen. *Ep.* 14, 17-8 '*is maxime divitiis fruitur* (see 152 here), *qui minime divitiis indiget'... Epicuri est aut Metrodori...aut alicuius ex illa officina.* It is probable, though difficult to prove, that Epicurus preached against luxury in his Περὶ πλούτου.

St. here also exculpates Polla (and Pollius) from the contrary error, that of avarice (on *avidi...fenoris* below). That this is also an orthodox Epicurean point of view, also defended in Περὶ πλούτου is less probable. There is only one Epicurean text which points that way: Diog. Laert. X 120 a (= Usener *frg.* 572).

It is rather the *aurea mediocritas*, a general philosophical ideal, which had already become a literary commonplace, which is in Sts.' mind: see Brink on Hor. *Ars* p. 115, Nisbet-H. on Hor. *Carm.* II 10, 5, Hor. *Carm.* II 2, 3-4 (*argentum*) *nisi temperato splendeat usu.* St. employs the same commonplace for Vopiscus at I 3, 92-3 *sanusque nitor luxuque carentes/ deliciae*, for Melior at II 3, 70-1 and for Crispinus at V 2, 73-4 *nitorque/ luxuriae confine tenens.* St. wants to protect these men against the reproach of being rich and *fortius loqui quam vivere* (Sen. *Dial.* VII 27, 1). This is what Sen. tries to do more than once, and Cicero (*Parad.* 6) and Sallust (Nisbet-H.: *Carm.* II 2, *Intr.*) had also to defend themselves in this way.

St. varies in *arca, divitias, dispendia, fenoris, census* and contrasts *sepositas/ expositus, strangulat, torquent/fruendi* and *infelix, avidus, dispendia/temperies.*

This passage provides the central argument for Nisbet's identification of the two Pollas (1978, 7-8). He reasons as follows: Lucan's widow was called Polla Argentaria. Here there is a series of banking terms addressed to a woman, Polla. This means that St. is punning on the name Argentaria (*argentum*), as he does on *felix* in this poem (21-5n.), also in 150 *infelix arca.* Similarly the mention of the golden apples of the Hesperides at III 1, 158-60 *poma...Hesperidum gremio...ingere...Pollae; nam capit et tantum non degenerabit honorem* alludes to Argentaria. See II 7 *Intr.* under **IV.** and II *Praef.* 23-8n. (footnote).

As proof of the identification this is not convincing. Even if the two Pollas were identical, it would be doubtful if St. is punning on Argentaria here. He might have used the word *argentum* if he wished to do so.

sepositas...divitias: 'For you a sterile money-chest does not choke the hoarded wealth'. The money-chest, *arca*, is called *infelix* because it does not use the money, is infertile, and also because that makes the owners unhappy, *cf.* 107-11n. Thus *infelix, strangulat*, and *avidi* refer to the owners. For the thought: Mart. III 40, 2 *opibus...quas gravis arca premit.* St. says it in a positive phrasing at II 3, 70-1 *optimus...promere divitias* (n.).

tibi: Goes with *strangulat* and *torquent*, as a dative of disadvantage. Not *tibi expositas.*

avidique animum dispendia torquent fenoris: A difficult phrase. Vollm. explains *avidi dispendia fenoris* as 'the waste of greedy usury' (Mozl.): money which is not lent against a heavy profit is wasted. This must be wrong. As *temperies* shows, two opposite faults must be mentioned, in this case hoarding money and usury. The *medius limes* of II 3, 67 consists also *i.a.* of being disinterested in money and spending it freely (70-1). *Infelix* and *avidi* should probably be contrasted.

This implies that *que* is used for *nec*, a not unusual practice since Augustan poetry: *et* and *que* often alternate with *nec, aut, ve*: *LHSz.* 500.

I explain the whole as 'you are not tortured by the (possible) loss of capital which you have lent against high interest'. *Dispendium* is 'the loss resulting from a transaction' (*OLD* 2a) and St. either refers to the fear or to the reality of such losses for the money-lender. For the anguish resulting from the possession of money: Hor. *Carm.* III 16, 17 *crescentem cura sequitur pecuniam*, Ov. *Fast.* I 211, Juv. 14, 139, Otto 1890 no. 1369n. The plural *dispendia* occurs since Verg. *A.* III 453, *cf.* Ov. *Am.* I 7, 25, I 14, 43, Bednara 543. *Avidum fenus* is the capital greedy for its interest: Luc. I 181 *usura vorax avidumque in tempora fenus*, or it is the interest itself (*OLD* 1) hungry for food, Frère's *risques de l'avide usure.*

expositi census: Wealth (*OLD* 3) exhibited for everyone to see. The same compliment: II 3, 71 *opibus immittere lucem*, for *expositus*: I 2, 34, V 3, 246 *expositos mores*, Luc. V 102 *expositum cunctis nullique negatum numen*, see II 3, 15-6 *aperti...sine fraude lares.*

docta fruendi temperies: The money is not only there for everyone to see, Polla and Pollius enjoy it, but they are moderate.

temperies: St. is the only author before Claud. who employs the word in the sense of *temperantia, temperatio* (Schubert 39). In other authors and *Th.* VI 234 it means 'a moderate climate' or 'a balanced mixture'. St. has it in II 6, 49 in the same sense as here, 'moderation', 'restraint', see *OLD* 3.

On this phenomenon, that a strange expression occurs not once but twice in the same author (Apuleius, the *Ciris*), Löfstedt (1942^2, 105) remarks '*dass...die...Tendenz zur Wiederholung einer sprachlichen Rarität für*

manche Vertreter eines stark individuellen oder raffinierten Stils charakteristisch ist', see 83-5n. here (*procul*).

153-4. Concordia: *Concordia* is important in marriage: I 2, 240, V 1, 43-4 *vos collato pectore mixtos iunxit inabrupta Concordia longa catena*, Cic. *Clu.* 12 *nuptiae plenae concordiae*, see V 2, 157 (two friends) *haec concordia vobis, hic amor est.*

No marriage is better, says St., than that of Pollius and Polla: *deo meliore* is *Concordia* herself. Out of *meliore* something like '*melius*' must be thought with *Concordia docuit*, as Vollm. says, *cf.* III 2, 77 (*magis*) *nubila Plias...peior Orion, Th.* III 454, (*magis*) *pronus...largius*, Prop. I 2, 13 with Rothstein. *Concordia* has joined husband and wife in love (*pectora*) and spiritual harmony (*mentes*).

docuit: *Concordia* has in the first place taught Concord, *cf.* II 1, 120-4n., II 6, 76-9n. The following *discite* suggests that they must go on learning, not only unanimity but everything (*docta* 152, *mentes*), see Sen. *Ep.* 76, 3 *tamdiu discendum est quemadmodum vivas, quamdiu vivis.*

143-6. Discite...ite: A wish for long life (107-11n.) and love. *Discite securi* suggests that the untroubledness of Pollius and Polla (140 *securos*) is (partly) the result of their philosophical attitude.

Conjectures for *discite* (*vivite*: σ, see also Reeve 143, Madvig, read by Cruceus, Markl., Baehr., and Clouard) are unnecessary. Housman (1906, 43) postulated a lacuna after *Concordia mentes*, followed by Saenger. But the sequence *docuit-discite* seems above reproach, and that Concordia teaches love and unanimity is easily understood.

quorum de pectore mixtae...coiere faces: 'You, whose torches mingled eagerly and were united'. *Quorum* goes with *faces* (not with *pectore*, as Mozl. translates), the marriage-torches. *De pectore* goes with *mixtae* 'with all your heart', see V 1, 43-4 above and for *de pectore*: IV 6, 55 *de pectore gaudens.*

St. employs a common range of words for love and friendship: *fax* (*OLD* 2a, 7), *miscere* (*OLD* 3a, 4c, 5b, e.g. Prop. IV 7, 19 *Venus trivio commissa est pectore mixto*), *coire.* But he combines them in an original fashion: it is not the persons, but the *faces* which mingle and come together, and *pectus* refers to emotions, not to the body.

in longum: For a long time to come: IV 7, 41, *OLD* 9b.

sanctusque...amor: 'And whose hallowed love keeps fast the laws of chaste affection': Mozl., *pudicae* (II 1, 40n.) *amicitiae* is a striking expression for marriage. I think St. refers to a pure marriage which is rather more a friendship (a concept of marriage not found elsewhere in St.) because of Pollius' interest in Epicureanism.

For Epicurus marriage and family life are sources of disturbance: Usener *frg.* 525, 526, *cf.* Diog. Laert. X 118, Diels B 276. But Polla and Pollius were married and had children (III 1, 175-9, IV 8). The most flattering praise of their marriage which St. can bestow on them is that it is rather *amicitia*, the friendship which Epicurus praised so abundantly: *Kur. Doxai* 27, *Sent. Vat.* 52, Usener *frgg.* 538-42, Cic. *Fin.* I 65 *Epicurus...dicit...nihil maius esse amicitia*, Bailey *Intr.* Lucr. 65-6, Rist 127-39.

annos saeculaque: I 4, 125-6 *Troica saecula et Euboici...pulveris annos.* But St. also, by varying *in longum* with *saecula*, has shifted his wish for a long life to one for lasting fame, *famae*: I 2, 90 *veteres transgressus amores, Th.* III 156 *Ogygias titulis anteire parentes.*

priscae titulos...famae: 'Renown won by famous couples of old'. Both *tituli* (or *titulus*) and *fama* mean 'fame'. A similar pleonasm occurs at II 7, 62, *Th.* X 711-2 *gloria...decus titulique.* Liv. VII 1, 10 *titulo tantae gloriae*, see *Th.* X 739 (and frequently) *aequore campi.*

This kind of gen., called *genitivus inhaerentiae* or *identitatis*, where the two nouns are more or less synonymous is frequent in late Latin, but occurs already in classic authors, generally in a few fixed combinations, e.g. *mens animi, temporis aetas* (Tib., Prop., Ov.) *litoris ora* (Verg. *G.* II 44, VFl. IV 613, Silv. III 1, 100, III 3, 162), see *LHSz.* 63 and for St.: Brakman 256 (very unreliable, see Mulder on *Th.* II 176).

It is not unthinkable that St. wants to imply by this *famae*, that he himself as a poet is responsible for this, a thought which is explicit in II 3, 63.

II. 3. ARBOR ATEDII MELIORIS

Silvae II 3:
R. Argenio, *L'albero di Atedio Meliore.* MC 4 (1950), 135-7 (Italian translation).
H. Cancik, *Untersuchungen* (Tübingen 1965), 48-56.

Epigram:
A. J. Adams, *The Nature of Martial's Epigrams.* Ann Arbor 1975.
Ed. G. Pfohl, *Epigramm. Zur Geschichte einer inschriftlichen und literarischen Gattung.* Darmstadt 1969.
R. Reitzenstein, *Epigramm.* In: *RE* VI (1909) 71-111.

Other:
P. Grimal, *Les jardins romains.* Paris 1969[2] (1947).

Birthday poems:
See II 7 *Introduction.*

I. The poem tells the story of a plane-tree in the garden of Statius' friend Atedius Melior: it was planted near a pool by Pan after the fruitless pursuit of a nymph, who had saved herself by plunging into the pool.

This elegant poem shows better than any other one in the second book how St. shapes and adapts different literary influences to form a new and original whole. It presents itself as a combination of an *aition* (2-5, *causas* 6) and a birthday poem for Melior (62-3). St. himself says of it: *In arborem...tuam, Melior, et psittacum scis a me leves libellos quasi epigrammatis loco scriptos.* He adds: *eandem exigebat stili facilitatem leo mansuetus* (II *Praef.* 15-8).

An *aition* is also the 'central panel' (to use a phrase coined by Newmyer) of I 2, 51-200, III 1, 49-153 and III 4, 21-77. According to Newmyer (62), this *aition* always consists wholly or largely of a speech by a divinity who explains the cause of the phenomenon under discussion. This is somewhat overstated for II 3, for only 13 lines of the aetiological story (8-61) contain direct speech (24-6, 43-52).

There exist several birthday poems or *genethliaca* in Latin literature, see II 7 *Intr.* for an enumeration and a treatment. This poem cannot be considered as a *genethliacon* in the strict sense: it is not a poem which celebrates a birthday, but a poem which was offered as a birthday present (*cf.* Fr. 72 n. 1). That means that Melior's birthday is wholly incidental to the poem and that all the *topoi* of the *genethliacon* are absent[1].

---

[1] The combination of a *genethliacon* and a different kind of poem is found in Tib. I 7, which celebrates both Messalla's birthday and his triumph, see Cairns 1972, 165-9.

The tradition to offer a poem as a birthday present can be shown in the epigram: *AP* VI 321, 325, 329, all by Leonidas of Alexandria, who lived a generation before St., *cf.* Schmidt 1908, 19 and for a Latin parallel Mart. X 87. The epigram was probably a popular present on these occasions[2].

Sts.' phrase *quasi epigrammatis loco* is often explained more or less as 'II 4 and II 5 are extended epigrams', leaving out II 3, e.g. Fr. 72 n. 1, 78 n. 1, Herrlinger 71. St. expresses himself in guarded terms: 'trifling poems, written as if they were epigrams'. As regards II 3, he may allude to the purpose of the poem: it is a birthday present, like an epigram. But what the three poems, II 3 and 4 and 5, have in common is rather their subject (rightly Vollm. 25 and Herrlinger 87): Mart. IX 61 has a subject similar to that of II 3. It describes a plane-tree within the house; often drunken Fauns play there, and the nymph hides from the pursuing Pan. The dead animal (II 4 and 5) is a very popular subject for the epigram, and so is the circus-poem (II 5), see *Introductions* there.

This should not blind us to the fact that none of these poems has a close resemblance to an epigram. In the first place, they are much too long for that: only seven epigrams of the *Anthologia Graeca* count more than 24 lines, the longest one having 76 lines (*Intr.* to the Tusculum-edition 32). There is only one poem in Mart. I which is longer than the shortest of these poems (I 49); and even in the books with Martial's longest epigrams (X-XII) there are only 30 poems with more than 16 lines, see Adams 65, 151 n. 27. Martial has written only four poems in hexameters. But long epigrams are at least possible: Mart. VI 64 is in hexameters and has 32 lines. In VI 65 he says that this kind of epigram is not unusual or forbidden. The epigrams of Pedo, Marsus and Pliny may have been longer than Martial's, *cf.* Mart. II 77, 5-6, Adams 151 n. 27, Reitzenstein 109.

Secondly, the three mainstays of Martial's epigrams are simplicity, realism and brevity, see Adams 42-52, 59-66, 133. None of these things are characteristic for St. And 'point', defined as 'a concluding thought, consisting of one line or less...summarizes or pulls together everything which precedes' (Adams 90), is characteristic for Mart., but not for St.[3]. There are differences between Mart. and Catullus, or the Greek epigrams, but it seems safe to say that St., esp. in II 3, does not resemble

---

[2] Mart., like St., has an original variation on this use, in his case by combining several epigrams, *cf.* Buchheit 1961 (Philologus).

[3] Cancik (1965, 19) and esp. Cancik-Lindemaier (n. 55 and n. 56) are probably right in disputing that 'point' is exclusive to the epigram. They prefer to speak of a 'pointed style', present in both the *Silvae* and Mart. But 'point' as defined by Adams is clearly present in Mart. and absent in the *Silvae*.

closely any existing epigram, wide as the term may have been (*cf.* Reitzenstein 111). See also Pfohl 1969 *Einleitung* 2-3 and *Introduction* to the Tusculum-edition 32-3, where length is the main criterion to discern the epigram from elegy.

When St. speaks of *stili facilitas* he cannot refer to a simpler kind of diction, or he is misleading us, for it is impossible to detect a difference in stylistic level from that of II 1 or II 2. Note, in this connection, the highflown language of II 4 (e.g. 4, 15, 25-9), the epic allusions of II 3, 25-6, 35, 42, 49-50n. *tutari*, 57-9, II 5, 15 (notes there). The many words here which are rare in St., without being vulgar (see 23-4n., 35n., 49-50n., 53-5n., 60-1n., 66-7n., 70-1n.), imply that his style is not 'easy'[4]. His *levis* must again refer to the subjects: the poems are not as serious as those treating death and solace (II 1, 6, 7) or the philosophical villa of II 2. *Facilis* and *facilitas* are not used elsewhere as critical terms by St. In II *Praef.* 17 he employs the word to refer to his talent for improvisation and fluency, see Quint. *Inst.* X 7, 1-9 *facilitatem...extemporalem*, Fr. XXXI-XXXIV, II *Praef.* 8-13n. But *facilitas*, fluency, does not merely refer to improvisation. It is a term of literary criticism, sometimes used in a characterization of the *genus tenue* in oratory: Cic. *Orat.* 21 (*genus tenue*) *uno tenore, ut aiunt, in dicendo fluit nihil adferens praeter facilitatem et aequabilitatem*, Sen. *Ep.* 40, 12 *expedite magis quam concitate, ut posses dicere facilitatem esse illam, non celeritatem* (see Sen. *Con.* II *Praef.* 2), *Ep.* 120, 9, Quint. *Inst.* II 4, 17 *erit suum parandae facilitati tempus*, IV 1, 54, X 1, 44, X 4, 145, X 5, 1 *copia et facilitas.* See *TLL* VI^1 73, 29 ff. This fluency, which Quint. also calls *firma facilitas* (X 1, 1), results from possessing *verborum figurarumque facilis copia et inventionis ratio*, see Peterson on X 1, 1 and Lausberg §§ 7, 1092, 1151. So St. implies 'for these trifles I needed all my fluency'. He probably means his public to take serious rather the hidden boast in *facilitas* than his self-depreciation in *leves.* See also II *Praef.* 8-13n, 62-3n. below.

II. The offering of a longer poem as a birthday present, the use of an *aition* for this purpose and the 'private' *aition* itself, which explains the origin of one specific tree in one specific garden of about 90 A.D., are original, as far as we know.

But the main interest is, I think, in the way St. makes use of Ovidian themes and motifs in the telling of his story. The *aition* makes us think first of all of the *Fasti* and there is one story in it with parallels both in the setting and the wording: the ass of Silenus (I 391 ff. Its doublet VI 319-48 has no such parallels): *Panes*, Satyrs and Naiads play a part in it,

---

[4] The poems are not at all simple in content or form, as claimed by Aricò 1972, 48, and in Traglia-Ar. 44 n. 18, see *Intr.* here and II 4 *Intr.* and 22-4n.

there is an attempt at the rape of a nymph, and the whole is pervaded by a lustful mood similar to that of II 3 (*cf.* also *Fast.* II 305 ff.). For the verbal parallels see 8n., 9n., 19-20n.

Another main strand of the literary influence is found in the *Metamorphoses*: the pursuit of the nymph is reminiscent of Apollo and Daphne (I 452 ff.), Pan and Syrinx (I 689 ff.), Coronis and Poseidon (II 569 ff.), Arethusa and Alpheius (V 572 ff., *cf.* also Lotis and Priapus IX 347, a one-line variation on *Fast.* I 391 ff.), Io (I 597-8). The point of all those stories is a metamorphosis, and we realize that *Silv.* II 3 also represents a kind of metamorphosis (noticed and illustrated very well by Cancik): St. identifies the nymph with the pool into which she has jumped: *aestuet, feriatur* (47), 55-7, 60-1, *cf.* on 45 *preme*; and likewise Pan is identified with the tree which he has planted: 45, 53-7, 60-1, *cf.* on 40 *manus, vertex,* Vollm. at 46 '*Von jetzt an vermischen sich die Vorstellung der Nymphe selbst und des Wassers*', Geissler 42 '*Totum...in hoc fundamento positum est, ut ad arborem quasi viventem Pan amorem suum transferat. Hac re nisus Statius arboris formam describit et interpretatur*' and Fr. 72 n. 1[5].

At the same time, nymph and water, Pan and tree, are kept apart explicitly in 34, 43 *pignus voti*, 44 *cubilia nymphae*, 49-50 *dominam sedis.* This results in an ambiguous situation, full of the paradoxes which St. loves so much[6]. But it also points to the story which had, I think, most influence on St., that of Arethusa. The story of Apollo and Daphne has little relevance for II 3: the only point of connection is the flight of the girl. Sexual pleasure is virtually absent from Apollo's thoughts (*cf.* esp. 504 ff.). Its central idea is the power of love. Vollm. (p. 356), followed by Fr. (72 n. 1) and Bömer (on *Fast.* I 691), considers the story of Syrinx and Pan as Sts.' model. But in this narrative, like Daphne's, the metamorphosis is a real and lasting one. Arethusa, on the other hand, both *is* the source: V 573 *cur sis, Arethusa, sacer fons*, 636 *in latices mutor*, and lives within the source: 574-5 *dea sustulit alto/fonte caput*[7]. In Ovid she is bathing and then pursuited by Alpheius, a sequence which is more or less reversed by St., just as the stress which Ovid puts on her nakedness (593-5, 601-3) is reversed by St. (16-7, 32-3): contrast 601 *sicut eram, fugio sine vestibus* with 33 *sic tota cum veste ruit*, see 595 *nudaque mergor aquis* and 30-4n. here. Also both Daphne and Syrinx are addicted to Diana, but only in the story of Arethusa, as in St., Diana acts as *dea ex machina* and

---

[5] The many stories in Ovid where Pan figures may have an explanation in Pan being a specialist in metamorphoses, see Borgeaud 125, 167.

[6] Bright completely misses the point of the poem in stating 'the girl died and the tree bent down in mourning' (49). He repeats the idea that the nymph dies (60-3) to connect II 3 with the other poems about death in *Silv.* II.

[7] For this Ovidian technique, see Frécaut 164-6.

saves her nymph. In the motif of the *locus amoenus* (Ov. 586 ff., see below), and especially in verbal parallels, St. once again shows his indebtedness to this story, see notes on 3, 13-4, 16-7, 33, 42, 45. For Sts.' attraction to the myth of Arethusa, and also for the identification of goddess and water, *cf.* II 2, 17-9n. The only one to have noticed that *Met.* V 572 ff. is Sts.' main inspiration is Håk. (68, 70).

As St. emulates Ovid in his play with the metamorphosis, putting it as it were on a more abstract level, he also tries to improve on him with another motif, that of the mirror: the charm of the plane-tree is that it mirrors itself into the water, seeming to grow out of it: 4-5, 59-60; or, one could say, the love of Pan and the nymph, denied in 'real mythology', is consumed in their metamorphosed form: the shadow, which is the image, of the tree (*umbris* 55, *cf.* II 2, 45-9n.) does love the water, and the nymph does not hate the tree, but invites it (60-1). But the consummation of love is only superficial, visible but intangible: the tree must try to possess the water: *preme frondibus undam* (45), *spargere, turbare* (48), but it can only touch with its image, not in reality (55-7). '*Das Spiegelbild...liegt auf der Oberfläche und dringt doch in das Wasser ein...Diese ausschliessende Verbindung....*' (Cancik 1965, 50, *cf.* 43 ff.). The mirror is one of the constituent elements in Ovid's narrative of Echo and esp. Narcissus (*Met.* III 339 ff., esp. 369 ff. and 407 ff.). But there the main theme is self-knowledge (*si se non noverit* 348, *cf.* Cancik 1967). What St. stresses here and elsewhere is the reflection as a state half-way between reality and imagination: their love is fulfilled and at the same time it is not, while Narcissus' sterile love can in no way ever be fulfilled, *cf.* Cancik 1967, 51.

III. A similar half-way situation between the real and the fictional is seen in the mingling of Hellenistic myth and Roman topography: nymph and Pan traverse the hills of Rome, ending up in the future garden of the rich Roman Atedius Melior (12-5), *cf.* II 2, 100-6n.

This same ambiguity is expressed by the Roman garden itself: the Roman garden is different from Nature in two ways: it is civilized Nature, and thereby 'unnatural'; and secondly it points to something beyond itself; it is a sacred and mythical place, a man-made garden of gods (see Grimal, esp. *Introduction* and Ch. X *Le paysage sacré, le paysage littéraire* p. 307: '*Ce poème* (*Silv. II 3*) *ne se comprendrait pas si l'habitude n'avait existé de créer dans les jardins de véritables paysages idylliques et quasi mythologiques*'. For Greece, see Motte 1973, 19-22, 88-9). The garden of old was sacred and especially connected with Dionysus and his following: Plin. *Nat.* XIX 50 *horto...dicari videmus...satyrica signa*, see Grimal 42-3 for Priapus, fauns *etc.* This same connection remained in existence, in a

more literary sense: the *nymphea*, the link with satyr-plays (Vitr. V 6, 9 *Satyricae* (sc. *scenae*)...*ornantur arboribus, speluncis, montibus, reliquiisque agrestibus rebus in topeodis speciem deformatis*, Grimal 240 ff., 304 ff., 321 ff., Cancik 1965, 52), expressed also by a multitude of statues of satyrs, fauns, nymphs (esp. Grimal 326-7).

In this only half-realistic garden, '*toute une Arcadie*' (Grimal 307), it is not surprising, but rather fitting, to meet nymphs and Pans. The gardens of Pliny give us some idea of what Melior's garden may have looked like: *Ep.* II 17, 14-5 and 17, V 6, 16-7: hedges cut into various shapes, 19-20: plane-trees and a basin, 32-3 a *hippodromus* surrounded by plane-trees, overgrown with ivy, buxus, bay-trees and cypresses, 35-6 variously shaped hedges again, acanthus, a pergola with a fountain, 39-40, a room again with vine and a fountain inside. Water was abundant in all Roman gardens, both for practical reasons (irrigation) and aesthetic ones, see Grimal 293-9. But Pliny's descriptions miss the explicit connection with mythology and literature. This *is* found in Mart. IX 61, influenced by St. or merely starting from the same suppositions, where a plane-tree within the house is described, see above and II 2, 100-6n. The poem, however, does not play with the tensions between the real and the unreal as St. does.

Apart from the (mainly Ovidian) literary influences and the cultural phenomenon of the garden in Sts.' time, some other *topoi* appear: that of the *locus amoenus*, which has its roots in reality and in literature (see 35-42n.). St. celebrates this quaintly grown tree and in I 3, 59-60 the tree growing *mediis penatibus* (*cf.* Mart. above). For diatribes against 'unnatural' gardens, *cf.* II 2, 52-62n., Sen. *Con.* V 5, Hor. *Carm.* II 15, 4 ff., Sen. *Dial.* III 21, 1 *etc.*, Grimal 392 ff., 409-12, 415-6. Next to these two cultural and literary traditions, there is a purely literary one, *viz.* the love elegy: virtually nowhere else does St. describe physical love; the allusion to the *exclusus amator* (see 18-20n. and at 48, 61) shows that it is not only the love of the *Metamorphoses*, but also that of the elegy which St. has in mind.

IV. I divide the poem into **1.)** Introduction 1-7, **2.)** *Aition* 8-61 a) Pan and the Nymph 8-34, b) pool and tree 35-61, **3.)** *Peroratio* 62-77, with praise of and good wishes for Melior, following Cancik 1965, 49. **2.** a) and **2.** b) are of equal length; both have a speech in their central part, both work along the same line of *Verwicklung, Retardation, Lösung*: pursuit (8-20), action of Diana (20-30), escape (31-4); Pan's doubts (35-42), Pan's action (43-53), the fulfilment of love, which is a solution on a higher level than 31-4 and expressed by a final '*pointe*' (53-61).

On Atedius Melior see II 1 *Intr.* His garden and house on Mt. Caelius are only known from this poem, but the right bank of the Tiber was a favourite spot for gardens: Mart. I 108, 2, Plin. *Ep.* IV 2, 5, Grimal 108-10, 162[8].

1-7.: A description of the strange tree in Melior's garden, with use of the formula for the ekphrasis (II 2, 1-3n.), in the shape of a question: *stat...cur.* The nymphs and Fauns are invoked to explain the origin of the tree, as the most apt divine powers, as in I 5, 6 and 23 ff. Thus the tone for the poem is set.

Three ways to begin a poem are connected here: the mention of the adressee (1), the question (2. See for both II 1, 1-3n.) and the invocation of divine inspiration (6-7, see below). The main points are touched upon: the clear water (1, 5) where the tree mirrors itself (1, 4) and the love of the tree (*complexa* 2), with point and variation (*aquas, lacus, vadis, undis, amnem,* see II 2, 49-51n.).

1-5. Stat quae perspicuas...opacet/arbor aquas complexa lacus quae robore ab imo/curvata vadis redit inde cacumine recto: This is in M. *Curvata* in 3, rendering the vs. unmetrical (but printed by Clouard), indicates a corruption.

The oldest emendation is *incurvata* (RB^r), printed by Baehr., Vollm., Kl., Postg., Phill., Mozl., Mar., Sb., Traglia. Politian proposed *accurvata* which is unknown elsewhere in Latin. But, as was first pointed out by Postg., a question is indicated by *regem* 6, and also by *causas.* The most natural word for it is *cur,* see e.g. Ov. *Met.* V 573 (*Intr.*), XII 179, *Fast.* II 283, *quare* in *Met.* IV 285. Postg. wrote it instead of *quae* (2) and in combination with *incurvata*, Saeng. at the beginning of 3 with *instrata.* Havet (179) conjectured *cur curvata* (repeated by Damsté 1923, 152). It is printed by Fr. No other editor explains the sentence as a question.

The choice between *incurvata* and *cur curvata* is difficult: Havet's conjecture is the easiest one from a palaeographic point of view, not because *cur curvata* <*curvata* is so much easier than *incurvata* <*curvata* (thus Fr. *app.*), but because *cur.../incurvata* involves a double corruption. The repetition in *cur cur* is not suspect, *cf.* II 1, 48-9n. (and add for *quisquis is* Ov. *Tr.* III 11, 56 and 12, 56) and Ov. *Fast.* II 283 *Cur igitur currant et cur...sic currere mos est.*

Whether the original text was *cur curvata vadis* or *cur...incurvata vadis*, we must explain *vadis* as a dative of direction. The use of this dative becomes

[8] There is nothing about Melior in A. M. Colini, *Storia e topografia del Celio nell' antichità* (Città del Vaticano 1944 (*sic*)). He does, however, mention a shrine of Diana on Mt. Caelius, referred to in Cic. *Har.* 32.

more and more frequent with and after Vergil in poetry. It is often found with nouns indicating water, e.g. Verg. *A.* II 37 *pelago ....praecipitare,* Ov. *Met.* IV 91-2 *lux...praecipitatur aquis,* Luc. IV 525 *astra vergere ponto,* in St.: I 1, 82 and I 5, 33 *ire lacu, Th.* III 57 *pelago descendente,* VII 435 *fluvio praecipitare,* see Landgraf 1892, 69-74 (to be read critically), Löfstedt 1942², 180 ff., *LHSz.* 100-1, *cf.* 72-4n.

This dative with either *curvare* or *incurvare* has no very convincing parallels: for *curvare* there is none (*TLL* IV 1547, 77 ff. and for *curvus* 1550, 74 ff. Note, however, Plin. *Nat.* XII 22 *rami in terram curvantur*). For *incurvare TLL* (VII 1095, 32 and 1096, 13) quotes this line and August. *In psalm.* 162, 4 p. 889^{in} *anima...(corporis) concupiscentiae serviens incurvatur mundo* and some Christian instances of *incurvare ad.*

A choice is difficult. I think that this dative (though these datives indicate an objective rather than purely a direction, see Löfstedt *loc. cit.*) is easier after *incurvata* than after *curvata*: an audience or reader would perhaps take *vadis* with *redit*; but this would be corrected by *inde.* St. invented some compounds with *in-* which are followed by a dative: *irrugare* (*Th.* IV 266), *inserpere* (*Th.* I 340), *irreptare* (*Th.* IV 386, *Silv.* III 1, 178), see Schamberger 296, 303-4. This shows that a dative after compounds with *in-* was productive, and that St. trusted his public to recognize this use. Therefore I accept Postgate's *cur robore ab imo/incurvata vadis.*

Both readings postulate a semi-colon or a full stop after *lacus,* first put there explicitly by Saeng. (but implied by Markland's *ea* for *quae* in 2; Mar. prints a semi-colon without comment). That the corruption does not lie in *vadis,* as is suggested by M² writing *nodis* (*in nodos*: Domitius, *enodis*: Markl., *cf.* 58), is shown by *inde.* I do not understand Phillimore's *qua* for *quae* (1), approved by Merrill 93.

Both *curvatus/curvus* and *incurvatus/incurvus* are frequently used for trees; in St.: *curvatus* V 4, 4 and *incurvus*: *Th.* II 500, 709, IV 419.

perspicuas...opacet...aquas: Two elements are emphasized: the water is crystal-clear and the tree overshadows it. They are pointedly juxtaposed in *perspicuas...vitreum/opacet.* By *ceu...amnem* (4-5) and *veluti... alia* (59-60) the reflection of the tree is suggested. The clearness: *vitreum,* vs. 34, *cf.* I 2, 155, *Th.* IV 818-9. The reflection results from this perspicuity, see *alia* 60, I 3, 17 ff. (in II 2, 45-9n.), I 5, 52 *fundo patet omnis ab imo* with 55 *hic te perspicuum melius, Narcisse, videres,* Verg. *A.* VIII 95-6 *variisque teguntur arboribus viridesque secant placido aequore silvas,* Maec. frg. 11 (Lunderstedt) *amne silvisque...comantibus* (= Sen. *Ep.* 114, 5), Plin. *Ep.* VIII 8, 2-4 *fons...vitreus...ripae fraxino multa, multa populo vestiuntur, quas perspicuus amnis velut mersas viridi imagine adnumerat,* Rut. Nam. I 284, Sid. *Ep.* II 2, 18.

Ausonius puts much stress on the clear water of the Moselle (55-75) and the reflections in it: 189-91, 225-9, 230-9, *cf.* Pavlovskis 1973, 35, stressing, like St. does, the tenuous difference between real and unreal. For *vitreus* and especially for the combination of reflection and shadow, see II 2, 45-9n., here *frondibus* 45, *umbris* 55.

The fountain where Arethusa bathes is not unlike: *Met.* V 587 ff. *aquas...perspicuas, per quas numerabilis alte/calculus omnis erat...salicta dabant ...(et) populus...natas...umbras.* She hangs her clothes *salici...curvae* (594).

For the *locus amoenus* with its water and shade see 35-42n.

opacet: is subjunctive with final colouring following *quae.*

aquas: the poetic plural occurs since Cic. and Var., often in Ov. Already in Homer: ὕδατα: Bednara 535-6. St. never employs the sing.

nitidi Melioris: See Mart. IV 54, 8 *nitido...Meliore*: 'elegant, sophisticated', like I 5, 63-4 *nitenti ingenio.* For Melior's culture, *cf.* II *Praef.* 1-5n.; for *nitidus* see at II 2, 10, II 7, 81-3n. *nitorem.*

complexa lacus: *Lacus* is acc. plur. (Vollm. on I 1, 1, Clouard, Fr., Traglia-Ar.), rather than gen. sing. (Mozl., Argenio), in view of 59-60 *imos lacus.* This is also suggested by the combination with *complexa,* see I 1, 2 *stat Latium complexa forum,* Claud. *Prob. et Ol.* 1, *amplexus* in IV 2, 24-5, Mart. IX 61, 5-6 *aedibus in mediis totos amplexa penates/stat platanus densis Caesariana comis.*

The poetic plur. occurs since Verg. *A.* III 386, see Schink 69, Maas 494, 504, 506, Neue-W. I 621-2. St. never employs the sing. in the acc. (and only once in the nom.); the genitive does not occur in St.[9].

complexa suggests that the tree is great (explicit in *ardua*), which implies its high age, *cf.* 8-20n. It also points forward to Pan's love, *cf.* 56 *sperat amplexus.*

robore ab imo: 'Directly at its base'. St. first mentions the tree itself, then its parts: *robur, cacumen* (57-9n.), *radices,* see also his variation in *aquas, lacus, vadis, undis, amnem,* 10 *fluminibus,* 16 *ripae,* 32 *fontem,* 33 *stagnis,* 36 *aquis* = 43, 45 *undam,* 48 *laticem,* 54 *stagnis,* 55 *undas,* 56 *aquarum,* 60 *lacus,* 61 *gurgite*: see II 2, 49-51n.

robore: is juxtaposed with *cacumine* and *radicibus* like *vadis/inde* and *incurvata/recto.*

ceu: Occurs 12 times in the *Silvae.* It is typical of poetry, but specifically of epic and tragedy. In elegy only in (the corrupt) Prop. IV 5, 19 and Ov. *Am.* III 9, 25; in Catul. only at 64, 239, in Hor. at *Carm.* IV 5, 19, not in Vergil's Bucolics and in Persius, *cf.* Axelson 89 n. 2. Though it occurs many times more in Sts.' epics (67 x), its popularity in

---

[9] In V 3, 44 M has *laci* which most editors treat as the gen. of *lacus.* In my opinion the text is corrupt there.

the *Silvae* points once again to their not being vulgar, *cf.* 49-50n., at II 2, 26 *lassa*, II 6, 100-2n., but also on 9 below.

habitet: *cubilia* 44, *sedis* 50.

tacitos: 'Invisible, hidden', like I 1, 35 *tacita face, Th.* II 487 *tacito ferro*, 523, *Ach.* I 725, 903 *etc.*; likewise *tacite* = *clam* at I 2, 194, IV 4, 37, *Th.* II 232 (with Mulder's note), *cf.* Håk. 30-1.

6-7. Quid Phoebum tam parva rogem? Vos...Naides et...Fauni: St. often invokes divine inspiration at the outset of his poems, or rather, at the end of his *prooemia*. This is traditional and often found in Prop., Tib. and Ov. It goes back ultimately on the invocation of the Muses, which appears already in Homer, see Abel (esp. 81, 91, 95), Schrijvers 1976, 410-1 (with literature, esp. on Ov.).

St. (like other poets before him, see e.g. Lucr. I 1 ff. and Bailey's commentary, Verg. *G.* I 7 ff.) makes a point of choosing the apt god(s) for his inspiration: the nymphs for Vopiscus' baths (I 5, 1-8), Saturnus and his following for the *Saturnalia*-poem (I 6, 1-7), Erato and Pindar for an ode (IV 7, 1-8), Apollo and Domitian for a serious poem on a servant of Domitian (V 1, 13-5). In I 2, 49 St. does the same thing in the middle of the poem: *Erato iucunda* for the *epithalamium*. Sometimes the addressee of the poem himself must inspire St.: I 4, 22, II 2, 39-40 (n.), V 3, 1-3 and 28. This last idea occurs since Prop. II 1, 3, *cf.* II 30, 40, Ov. *Am.* III 12, 16, Mart. VIII 73, 6, also in Germ., Man., Luc., and *Laus Pis.* 263, *cf.* Vollm. on I 4, 19, Michler 53.

In many cases this invocation starts with a *praeteritio*, which dismisses the gods which are not needed: I 4, 19-21, I 5, 1-8, 15-33, I 6, 1-8, *cf.* V 3, 3 ff., V 5, 1 ff. This is also a *topos*: Prop. II 1, 3, Man. I 10, Luc. I 63 ff., see Vollm. on I 4, 19, Lohrisch 119, Frère 1930, 305, Szelest 1972, 311 (but I disagree with Vollm., Lohrisch and Szelest that this technique is imported from the schools of rhetoric). Phoebus, the god of serious, or lofty, poetry is dismissed in all Sts.' instances.

For other aspects of '*Exordialtopik*', see Curtius 95, II 1, 1-3n., II 7, 5-11n.

parva refers to the less important *genres* of poetry, *cf.* IV 7, 3-4 *ingens opus in minores/contrahe gyros* and Vollm. on I 3, 50-1. It is opposed to *gravis* as a critical term in Prop. III 3, 18 and 22 and frequently used in *excusationes*, e.g. Hor. *Carm.* III 3, 72, *Ep.* II 1, 257 ff., Prop. III 3, 5, *cf.* Brouwers 85 ff. St. says: 'this is a short poem, a trifle' (see *Intr.*). That he does not wish to be taken at his word becomes clear in 62-3 (n.).

causas: Indicates an *aition*: Ov. *Fast.* I 1 *Tempora cum causis* with Bömer's note.

faciles...Fauni: *Faciles* <*exorari*>: 'benign, propitious': *OLD* 9b, *TLL* VI 62, 22 ff., *cf.* Hor. *S.* I 1, 22, Sen. *Oed.* 198 *faciles dei.* But *faciles* may be ambiguous here and also mean 'indulgent' (*OLD* 9a), *cf.* Verg. *Ecl.* 3, 9 (wrongly explained by *TLL*), Prop. II 29, 33 ('*hier in der Bedeutung von* **levis**...*nicht wesentlich verschieden*': Rothstein there), Mart. III 69, 5. However, this seems to be said only of girls.

For *Fauni*, see on *Pan* below (and for *Naides* on *Nymphae*).

satis est: 'Your presence will be sufficient', *cf.* I 5, 7-8 *Naidas... elicuisse satis.*

date carmina: I 2, 251, IV 2, 55 *iubet dare carmina Musas*, V 3, 1-3 *carmen...da, genitor*, see II 7, 81.

8-34.: Story of the pursuit of the nymph (8-14), near-rape (14-20), sudden help by Diana (20-30), and escape (31-34). It is introduced and closed by flight and pursuit in the same order (*fugiebant, it* 8-9 and *ruit, sequi* 33-4). So this first section is rounded off with a temporary solution by the escape.

The sudden introduction of Diana (*ecce* within the vs.) 'freezes' the greedy Pan in his almost effected rape: *iamiam...iam* 19-20, the climax of the hectic race: *it...it* 9, *nunc...nunc* 11, *iamque* 13. This is a retardation in the story: the reason for Diana's presence is given, her speech is recorded directly and her action is described at some length. This has the effect of pointing forward to the situation of tree and pool in the second part of the *aition*, the really 'frozen' representation of Nymph and Pan, esp. *imminet* 20/ *incubat* 55 (Cancik 1965, 50-1). And at the same time the reader is reminded of the statues in which Roman gardens abounded: Grimal 327 '(*le*) *groupe si souvent répété du Silène dévoilant une nymphe...indiscutablement un thème de jardin des plus fréquents*', see 309 for Diana, 317 ff., 337 ff. in general.

8-20.: We are plunged *in medias res* in vs. 8 without mention of place, time and circumstances. These only become clear gradually: the name of the nymph (10), the fact that she is clothed (16), the setting in Rome (12-6). The scene is intended to play before the foundation of Rome, *cf.* on 12-4, 15, but we must not take it so literal: it rather plays outside time, in a vague mythological past; not only that the tree would be impossibly old otherwise, but the topography of primitive and harsh Rome (*belligerum, atra* 12) is chiefly meant to set off the Hellenistic playful gods, and most of all civilized Melior (1, 15, 64-5) in whose garden they are represented (*cf.* Sts.' 'philosophy of progress': II 2, 52-62n., Cancik 1965, 109 and 1968, 70).

The scene is constructed in three parts: **1)** the hectic pursuit with its agitated syntax and its verbs of motion (*fugiebant, it, it, vitat, suspensa, subit*): 8-14, **2)** vss. 14-17 with rest (*victa, fessa, placidi, stant, collegit, posuit se*), **3)** the climax 18-20, agitated (*insequitur, velox, librat, levis*) again and full of passion (*ardenti, suspiria, imminet*).

8. Nympharum: varies on *Naides*, like *Pana* on *Fauni*. Strictly speaking, *nymphae* are divided into Naiads, Dryads and Oreads. But these distinctions are blurred in classical Latin poetry: the species is used for the genus and *vice versa* freely: Ov. *Met.* I 690 *inter hamadryadas celeberrima...Naias una fuit, Culex* 95 *fontis hamadryades*, Aus. *Mos.* 176 *inter Oreiadas Panope fluvialis amicas*, see Bömer on *Fast.* I 405, IV 229, *RE* XVII 1532 ff. St. is exceptional, in I 3, 62, in mentioning a Hamadryas and a Naias.

This nymph is called *Naias* again, like the nymph in *Fast.* I 391 ff. and Syrinx in *Met.* I 689 ff. (see *Intr.*), in 30 and 60.

For the scene as a whole, see II 2, 100-6n.

tenerae...catervae: I 2, 54 *tenerum...agmen Amorum*, II 2, 46, *Th.* II 353-4 *tenerum...dolorem coniugis*.

fugiebant: The imperf. tense both prepares the story to come (which is told mostly in the historical present; the perf. sometimes rounds off a part, e.g. *subit* 14) and paints the situation, see Chausserie Laprée 370, 387 n. 1, *LHSz.* 316.

Pana: Since the fourth century the distinction between Pan, Satyrs, Silenus and other members of the Dionysian throng has faded, and in most art of that time he is already depicted as a subordinate lusty figure (*RE Suppl.* VIII 949 ff., esp. 968-76).

In Roman times all these figures, together with the Latin gods Silvanus and Faunus have indissolubly combined (*ibid.* 986 ff., 1004, Lucr. IV 580 ff., Hor. *Carm.* I 17, 2 with Nisbet-H., Bömer on *Fast.* II 271, Pease on Cic. *Div.* I 106 and *ND* II 6, Borgeaud 119-20 with n. 21, 144-5). Thus Pan is put on one line here with *Fauni*, made slightly ridiculous in 35-7, called contemptuously a *petulans foedumque pecus* by Diana (25). In short, he is painted as one of the *Panes* of II 2, 106.

On the other hand his shaggy hide (11, 35-7) and horns (11) belong to both the Arcadian god Pan (Borgeaud 82-4) and the satyrs *etc.*; and St. gives him the attributes of the god: *pinus* 52 (n.), see *pecorum deus* 18 (n.). St. names Pan the Arcadian god in I 3, 78, *Th.* III 480, XI 34. The same representation of Pan as a mere lustful faun (see, esp. for the original elements in this conception of Pan as an erotic figure and an analysis, Borgeaud 122-4, 130-3), and at the same time the (literary form of) the Arcadian god is found in Ov. *Fast.* I 397 ff. where *Panes* join the party

(397), later mentioned as both *Satyri* and *qui pinu tempora nexa geris* (411-2).

The stories of Pan's love and pursuit of several nymphs (Syrinx, Echo, Pitys) are Hellenistic, see Borgeaud 88, 123-30.

9-10. Ille quidem it cunctas tamquam velit et tamen unam/in Pholoen: This is in M, followed by Vollm., Postg., Mozl., Mar., Traglia. Instead of *et*, σ has *it*, printed by the other edd.

It is preferable: *quidem it* is balanced by *it tamen*, like *cunctas* by *unam*. *Et*, which cannot be a connective particle here, would make *tamen* superfluous (*cf.* 46, 62 = *quidem...sed*). In the same way Saenger's *quamquam* (for *tamquam*)...*it* makes *quidem* superfluous.

The repetition of *it...it it* (see II 1, 48-9n.) is meant to illustrate the turmoil, like *cur* in *Fast.* II 283 (quoted at 1-5n.). For the deliberate exploitation of such effects, see Marouzeau 1935, 42-5.

tamquam: This word is studiously avoided in poetry. Of elegists only Ov. employs it (18 times). In epic also only Ov. (11) and Luc. (2, in the part which he did not publish himself). St., like Verg. (*Ecl.* 10, 60), has one *tamquam*. Similarly he employs *quasi* (another taboo in poetry) only in his prose: II *Praef.* 17, V *Praef.* 6. See Axelson 88-9.

Pan tries to give the impression that he pursues all nymphs indifferently, but in fact he concentrates on Pholoe, *cf.* Ov. *Fast.* I 417 *hanc cupit, hanc optat, sola suspirat in illa*. Perhaps St. makes a joke on Pan (Greek Πάν)/*cunctas*. The connection Πάν/πᾶς is already made in *Hymn. Hom.* 19, 47, also Pl. *Crat.* 408 c, Serv. on *A.* II 44, see *RE Suppl.* VIII 951, 1005. For Sts.' etymologies, see II 2, 36-42n. But since Sts.' example, Ov. *Fast.* I 415-6, has *Priapus omnibus ex illis Lotide captus erat*, and since etymology plays no part in the rest of the poem, I do not think this probable.

Pholoe: the name of a girl unwilling to be loved in Horace (*Carm.* I 33, 7 and 9, II 5, 17, III 15, 7) and Tib. (I 8, 69). Perhaps it occurred in Hellenistic poetry (*cf.* Nisbet-H. on Hor. *Carm.* I 33, 7). Sts.' choice is probably influenced by Hor. *Carm.* II 5, 17 *fugax Pholoe*, possibly by the connection between Pan and the mountains of Pholoe, a district in Arcady, *cf.* Ov. *Fast.* II 271-3, Luc. VI 388.

It seems wrong to conclude from the fact that the name is used only here for a nymph, that she is a '*Lokalgottheit*', as Szelest (1972, 311, 317 n. 24) does.

10-1. Silvis et fluminibusque...vitat: M. For *et*, m has *haec*, printed by most edd.; *ea*: Q, followed by Klotz (*cf.* van Dam 392). Krohn proposed *sed*, printed by Postg. and Fr. (as *set*, see Slater 1904, 302).

Et is superfluous. The position of *sed* would be exceptional, see II 1, 78-81n., and the contrast *it...sed...vitat* impresses one as somewhat too elaborate. Both *haec* (*ęc*: Slater *loc. cit.* and Fr. 1943 XXX) and *quae* (*silvisque*, see van Dam 393) are good: they introduce a new subject after *catervae...ille*, which seems in accordance with the traditional changing perspective of these scenes of pursuit (see Verg. *A.* XII 751 ff.). Of the two *haec* seems slightly better, in view of the preceding *ille* (e.g. II 2, 45-6), and the breathless syntax of these lines[10].

The topography is vague at first: 'by copse and stream': Mozl. (not '*à travers forêts et fleuves*': Clouard, Argenio, Traglia-Aricò, for Pan cannot swim: 35-7); then comes the concretization in the primitive Roman sites (*cf.* 8-20n.); thus *Nymphae* precedes the concrete *Pholoe.*

The theme of Pan pursuing nymphs is old. Ov. has many elaborate descriptions of pursuing gods. The description of the flight reminds of Ov. *Met.* V 612-7 *Per tamen et campos, per opertos arbore montes,/saxa quoque et rupes et qua via nulla, cucurri...sonitusque pedum* (sc. *Alphei*) *terrebat, et ingens...vittas adflabat anhelitus oris.* Bömer on *Met.* V 601 says: '*Verfolgungsszenen dieser Art scheinen für das Publikum jener Jahrzehnte ihren besonderen erotischen Reiz gehabt zu haben*', see *Intr.* above, Frécaut 246. See *RE Suppl.* VIII 949 ff. *passim* for the pursuing Pan in art, from the 5th-century Boston-crater onward, Borgeaud 117 ff. The erotic element here lies in *gressus...cornua vitat.*

sequentis...hirtos gressus...improba cornua: 'The hairy paws and the wanton horns of her pursuer'. There is a suggestion of *enallage*, but one can far better say that Sts.' tendency to single out parts of the whole to visualize them makes him say 'hairy paws of Pan', rather than 'paws of the hairy Pan' when both would be possible. This is made the more easy by the general use of a descriptive adj. with *manus* and the like, *cf.* II 1, 137-9n., II 6, 9n.

St. prefers the more abstract *gressus* to *pes*, as with *gradus* in II 2, 44 (n.). *Gressus*, like *gradus*, is used for a way of walking and only sometimes the concrete 'foot, leg, paw' must be meant, see *TLL* V^2 2327, 1 ff. '*praevalet notio quae pertinet ad pedem*'. *TLL* quotes *Th.* IX 531 *incerti...labant...gressus* (see *Th.* IV 311 at II 2, 44), XI 519, *Ach.* I 99-100 *gressibus aequor/reppulit* and *Silv.* I 2, 250-1 *qui nobile gressu/extremo fraudatis opus*, a metrical foot (as V 3, 99. Sen. *Her.O.* 1238). Also in Petr. 30, 9, *al.*

hirtos: see Sil. XIII 340 *hirtae...caudae* (a 20-line story about Pan), *PLM* III 29, 8 *hirte, hirsute.*

improba: more clearly *enallage* (*parva...cornua*: Sil. XIII 332): Pan is *improbus* for trying to rape Pholoe, *cf.* II 1, 2n. St. concentrates more on the

[10] Earlier I chose *quae*, see van Dam 392-3.

appearance of Pan than on the pursuit itself. I do not think that we are intended to picture how Pan's '*struppige...weitausschreitende Beinen*' almost touch Pholoe (Vollm.).

12-4.: The nymph runs criss-cross over the site of Rome. Thus St. shows again that his purpose is not historical or topographical veracity (8-20n.), but the evocation of wild and primitive aspects of the countryside: *nemus, rura, agros, tesca*, and the allusions to the mythico-historical past: *Ianus, Cacus*, see at 22 *Aventinae.* From the foot of the Capitoline she runs to the Aventine (see below), back to the Quirinalis in the north-west, to end up on the Caelius in the south-west. Similarly, the zigzag voyage on the Aegean of *Ach.* I 675 ff. is geographically spoken nonsensical, but it pictures the speed, see Legras 1908, 58.

belligerum Iani nemus atraque Caci/rura: Vollm. and Fr. claim without more that *belligerum Iani nemus* refers to the site of the temple of Ianus *ad infimum Argiletum* built by Numa: Liv. I 19, 2 and Ogilvie's commentary, Platner-Ashby 279, Holland 108 ff.

But the word *nemus* is slightly surprising: neither in Livy nor in any other source is a *nemus Iani* mentioned (see Holland *loc. cit.*); moreover, it is improbable that there really was a wood in this most marshy part of Rome.

The word must be explained from Sts.' sources, which are literary, not antiquarian. His use of *Cacus* points the way: *atra* in 12 is a reference to Vergil's account of this story in *A.* VIII 193 ff.: 198-9 *atros/ore vomens ignis*, 218 *nebula...specus aestuat atra* (see 252 ff.). The word does not occur in Ovid's (*Fast.* I 543 ff.) or Propertius' (IV 9, 1-20) version. After Euander has told the story of Cacus he shows Aeneas the site of Rome: *A.* VIII 345 *nec non et sacri monstrat nemus Argileti.* I think the most simple and preferable solution is that St., regardless of the question if there ever was a *nemus Iani*, or any wood at all anywhere at the *Argiletum*, invents the phrase out of a Vergilian reminiscence. Sts.' debt to Vergil's account of Aeneas and Euander becomes more clear if Euander's first words at showing primitive Rome are remembered '*haec nemora indigenae Fauni Nymphaeque tenebant*' (*A.* VIII 314).

There is yet another way in which St. can have used Vergil: *A.* VIII 347-8 *ad...Capitolia ducit/aurea nunc, olim silvestribus horrida dumis/* 351 *hoc nemus, hunc...frondoso vertice collem*, 357-8 *hanc Ianus pater, hanc Saturnus condidit arcem; / Ianiculum huic, illi fuerat Saturnia nomen.* This could be interpreted as 'one top of the Capitoline hill was called *Ianiculum*, the other *Saturnia arx*'. This would be another possibility for a *nemus Iani*, but one more beset with problems: it is likely that contemporaries of Vergil would have understood *Ianiculum* as the hill on the other side of the Tiber

(thus Servius, Holland 230 n. 27, Eden on *A.* VII 347 ff.). It seems safest to assume that St. would interpret it in this way, *cf.* also Ov. *Fast.* I 245-6 *arx mea collis erat....Ianiculum* about the hill on the other bank of the Tiber, and Bömer there. That **this** *Ianiculum* is meant by *Iani nemus* is also less probable than the first solution, in spite of *Fast.* I 243 *incaedua silva*, for it makes the nymph and Pan twice swim the Tiber. In both the 2nd and the 3rd solution the connection with *Cacus* is less obvious than in *Argiletum.*

The adj. *belligerum*, in *enallage*, refers to the custom of opening the doors of the temple in times of war (Holland 120 ff. with the sources, e.g. *A.* VII 601 ff.). Though the temple where this took place was that at the *infimum Argiletum*, this is no argument for the location of the *nemus Iani*, since IV 3, 9 *limina bellicosa Iani*, treat of the temple of Ianus Quadrifrons on the *Forum Domitiani* (Fr. 136 n. 4, Holland 92 ff. esp. 98).

For the adj. *belliger Ianus*: Luc. I 62, see *TLL* II 1814, 10-2 and *Silv.* IV 1, 13-4 *Ianus quem tu* (Domitian)...*omnia iussisti componere bella.*

Cacus is aptly mentioned here as the essence of primitive evil; *atra* contributes to the atmosphere of gloom and horror (*cf.* André 1949, 48 ff., esp. 50). St. undoubtedly thinks of Cacus' den as on the Aventine, as in Verg. *A.* VIII 231, Ov. *Fast.* I 551, not on the Palatine, where the *Scalae Caci* were (Platner-Ashby 465), and where Rose (in the *OCD* under *Cacus*) and Bayet (203) locate 'the original' Cacus.

nemus atraque...rura Quirinalesque...suspensa per agros: *Nemus, rura* and *agros* all depend on *per*, a unique case of triple *apo koinou.*

Apo koinou with a preposition is a rather undeveloped figure in Latin prose. But in poetry it is not infrequent, owing to Greek influence and to the greater freedom of word order in poetry, see *LHSz.* 834-5. Hor. seems the first to use it: *Carm.* III 25, 2-3 *quae nemora aut quos agor in specus, Ep.* II 1, 25 and 31. Verg. is sparing with it: *A.* II 654, V 512, VI 416, 692. Ov. has it esp. often with *in* + abl., see Bömer on *Met.* VI 190 (who is wrong in claiming that it occurs only once in Verg.), *TLL* VII 804, 1-29 and 37, II 5, 27-30n.

St. has *apo koinou* with *ad* at *Th.* VIII 384, *Ach.* II 104-5 (see *TLL* I 473, 29-34, VFl. I 716); with *in* + abl. at I 2, 56, I 3, 50, *Th.* V 189; *in* + acc. at V 2, 132; with *pro* at *Th.* IV 757, with *sub* at I 1, 57. For *per*, see *Th.* IV 643 *geminumque nefas miserosque per enses*, Verg. *A.* VI 692, Vollm. on II 5, 28.

I have not found another case of *apo koinou* where three words share the preposition, see also *TLL* I 3, 60-2 (*ab*), V^2 1129, 1-6 (*ex*), Housman 1916, 149. I think that St. here again (see on *tesca* below) emulates Ovid's story of Arethusa: *Met.* V 612-3 *per...campos per...montes, saxa...rupes.*

This is not *apo koinou*, because the preposition comes first (*LHSz.* 834), but St. has taken the construction of more nouns with one preposition from Ov., making it more suggestive of the breathless flight by postponing the preposition.

suspensa: 'flying', see *Th.* V 168 *praecipitat suspensa fugam*, Verg. *A.* VII 810; for *pendere* in this sense, see II 7, 1-4n.

Caelica tecta: This is in M, and printed by Phill., Clouard and Sb., and accepted in Vollmer's commentary. This could virtually only mean 'the houses on Mt. Caelius'. But, as Markl. pointed out, Pholoe keeps in the open. Vollm. explains *Caelica* as a noun (*hapax legomenon*), like *Hernica* (IV 5, 56) and *Pontica* (V 3, 188). This is possible, but his interpretation of *tecta* as 'hidden, out of the way' is in contrast with reality, gives a wrong sense to *tectus* and is not to the point. Nor does Merrill's (93) 'covered, presumably with woods' convince. Markland's *tesca* is undoubtedly right. It is a rare and archaic word for places devoted to rural deities: Var. *L.* VII 10 *loca quaedam agrestia quae alicuius dei sunt*, Fest. 488, 22 (L.) *loca augurio designata.* The poets employ it in the sense of 'wild, uncultured land': Enn. *scen.* 206 (Joc.) *aspera saxa tesca tuor*, Hor. *Ep.* I 14, 19, Luc. VI 41-2 *saltus nemorosaque tesca et silvas*, (where 2 mss. have *tecta*), *cf.* Luc. II 426 with Housman's note. It is an adj. in Acc. 554 R^3. It may be of Sabine origin: thus ps.-Acro on Hor. *loc. cit.*, see Ernout-Meillet *s. v.*

St. aptly employs this archaic word in his picture of ancient Rome. So does Vergil in the story of Aeneas and Euander, e.g. *perhibent* (*A.* VIII 324), *egenos* (365), see Gransden on 324 and Norden on *A.* VI, *Anhang* I 1. It has been pointed out by Waszink that a great part of Horace's archaisms occurs in poems about Roman (pre)history; for *catus* in *Carm.* I 10, 3, see Schrijvers 1973, 141 (Lampas).

A thorough treatment of Sts.' archaisms remains a desideratum. The most recent investigation (Klotz 1908) does not aim at completeness and has not succeeded in avoiding problems of definition (for those, see Lebek 11-22 and *LHSz.* 768-71), see Cancik *Forschungsbericht* § 2. The general picture appears to be that archaisms are not frequent in St., that they occur more often in the epics than in the *Silvae*, and that they go back upon Vergil rather than on archaic literature, see Cancik *loc. cit.* Archaic words (as different from phrases, forms and meanings) form the smallest group of Klotz' examples.

The examples from the *Silv.* which Kl. adduces are the following: II 1, 208 *quin* with 2nd person indic. (which is also vulgar, see *LHSz.* 676), II 1, 231 *genae* = eyes (Ennian, but taken from Augustan poetry by St., see note *ad loc.*, II 7, 133-5n., and Cancik *loc. cit.*), I 1, 107 and I 2, 135 the scansion of *hŭīc*, and finally V 4, 12 *sacer* meaning 'detestable' (an interpretation which may well be contested).

It is probable that more may be added by closer investigation: *parumper*, for instance, has an archaic flavour (Austin on *A.* VI 383) and occurs at IV 4, 37 (and 10 times in the epics), see also II 7, 5-11n. (*penes*). Some words in I 1, a poem which touches upon ancient Roman history (66 ff.), remind of early Latin literature: 12 *pueri innuptaeque puellae* refers to Verg. *A.* II 238, a passage full of reminiscences (see Austin). *Proles* in 74 is one of the words *quibus...grandior atque antiquior oratio saepe videri solet* (Cic. *De Orat.* III 153); but St. has it 16 times more, not always in an elevated context. *Hoc* instead of *huc* in I 1, 94 (and I 6, 46, in the typically Roman Saturnalia-poem) is also archaic, see Vollm. and Serv. on *A.* VIII 423. But in parts of the *Silvae* where St. touches upon Roman history (I 6 in a sense, IV 1, 2, 3, V 2, 3) no other conspicuous archaic words are found.

Saenger may well be right in implying that St. emulates Ov. *Met.* V 613 *qua via nulla* with *tesca.*

Caelicus as an adj. is also *hapax legomenon.* St. invented 7 Latin adjectives from proper names: *Maronianus* II 7, 74, *Maroneus* IV 4, 54, *Mantuanus* IV 7, 27, *Clitumnus* I 4, 29, *Neroneus* I 5, 62, *Tibereius* III 3, 66, see Speranza 1956, 45, 53, n. 62. Not surprisingly they are not found in the epics.

The adjectives ending in *-icus* are alien to epic diction, and St. has only three adjj. of this kind, the other two in his hendecasyllables: II 7, 29 *Baeticus* and IV 9, 35 *Lucanicus*. *Caelicus*, like *tamquam* (9), is an exception, *cf.* Schamberger 277-8, who is surprised that St. is so 'pure' in his diction in the *Silvae*, but see on *ceu* 4.

subit: For the contracted form, see II 1, 153-7n. *Subit. Ibi demum* occurs also at *Th.* II 474, *cf.* V 1, 258...*subit*; *ibi*...

14-7.: The effects of the running are painted, but as soon as peaceful Melior comes into the picture the nymph comes to rest, see 8-20n.; this is suggested by the gathering of her robe, which must have been flying around her, and stated in *posuit se.*

victa labore, fessa metu: A traditional preparation for the climax of a pursuit: Ov. *Met.* I 544 *victa labore fugae*, V 618 *fessa labore fugae*. *Fessa* not merely repeats *victa* but prepares the falling asleep of Pholoe, like *posuit se.*

This (improbable) trait in the story is not mentioned explicitly until 29, *cf.* Fr. *app.* on 17. It is an allusion to the erotic *topos* of the sleeping woman discovered and raped by the god (for instance Ilia and Mars), see Ov. *Met.* II 419 and V 505, with Bömer on the erotic implications of heat and drowsiness, VII 808 ff., XI 238, XIII 902, *Fast.* III 15, VI 331, see *Met.* III 413, *Fast.* I 424, Prop. I 3, 1-8. See Grimal 326-7 on the great

popularity of the sleeping Ariadne in art, probably at the source of the satyr and the sleeping nymph in sculpture. But the fact that the powers of Pan manifest themselves often when one is asleep may also be of relevance, see Borgeaud 118-9 (treating an Etruscan mirror where the sleeping Aphrodite is menaced with rape by three satyrs), 233-42. Moreover, *fessa metu* adds a psychological explanation for her falling asleep.

nunc: Once again characterizes the story as an *aition*. On the contrast then/now, *prius/nunc*, in Latin aetiological poetry, see II 2, 32-3n. Here the story is for the first time connected with Melior and his pool. For a somewhat similar turn, see Sid. *Carm.* 22, 117-9 *Paulinus Pontius olim cum...dominabitur ambiet* (*hunc montem*) *altis moenibus.*

placidi Melioris aperti...sine fraude lares: For *placidi* see II 1, 166-8n. By qualifying the house (*lares*) St. characterizes Melior himself, see II 2 *Intr.*, II 2, 22 and note, *Th.* VII 157, 787, X 88, *Ach.* I 740 = *Silv.* IV 8, 23.

aperti: is ranged under 'hospitable' by *OLD* (2b), *cf.* e.g. Cic. *Ver.* IV 3 *huius domus est nostris hominibus apertissima maximeque hospitalis.* St. had probably been Melior's guest several times, see II 4, 4 ff. and II 1 *passim.*

But it also means 'openhearted, needing no disguise', like *sine fraude,* about Melior, see *palam* (69), *promere* (71), I 2, 34-5 *expositum per limen aperto/ire redire gradu.*

sine fraude: see *honesta* (67), *incorrupte fidem* (68), III 1, 32 (Pollius' villa) *domus fraudum...malarum inscia.*

flavos collegit amictus/artius et niveae posuit se margine ripae: Both adjectives are problematical: nowhere in Latin is *flavus* used to designate clothing (*TLL* VI 888, 3-889, 79, esp. 889, 62-75, *cf.* André 1949, 128 ff., 353 ff.). Vollm. explains that it designates the nymph as associated with *flavus Tiberis*, but *flavus* is by no means exclusive to the Tiber, and, what is more, there is no question of the Tiber throughout the poem.

Either the word refers to something we cannot know (for instance a painting in Melior's home) or, more probably, it is corrupt. Corrections are *fluidos*: RB^r, printed by Clouard, and *fluxos*: Scriverius (see van Dam 393). Of these *fluxos* is superior: *fluidus* does not occur in St., and see *Ach.* I 533 *fluxae...vestes*, Luc. II 362 *fluxos gemmis astrinxit amictus*, Apul. *Fl.* VI 1, *cf.* Håk. 66-7. *Fluxos* is also palaeographically easier, *cf.* Ker 1953, 3. It is pointedly juxtaposed with *collegit artius.* Klotz' (1896, 76) *glaucos*, abandoned in his ed., is palaeographically improbable.

niveae...ripae has puzzled all interpreters. If *ripae* has its natural sense, 'bank', what does *niveae* then mean? Vollm. thinks of white pebbles on the bank. Fr. quotes I 5, 51-2 *niveo...margine caerulus amnis vivit* and sup-

poses that St. here alludes to a similar marble border which Melior has built around his pool (76 n. 1). But St. does not describe this elsewhere in the poem, and one wonders if it could have been built at all with the tree standing near the pool. Mozl. and Clouard think of white flowers on the shore. Not one of these guesses convinces.

Others have tried to emend *niveae*: Markl. wrote *viridis* (see van Dam 393). Saenger reads *niveos...amictus...flavae...ripae*, Grasberger (420) *curvae*, Schäfer *nitidae*, Phill. (*ed.app.*) *vivae*, see Håk. 67. If *ripa* is 'bank', the first three solutions all give good sense; but Saenger's seems the only one which is palaeographically attractive. *Flavus* is *inter alia* an epithet for the sand on the shore (André 1949, 129), see 41 *harenam* (but also note there).

Håk. (67-8) takes up Damsté's explanation (1923, 143) that *ripa* means 'water'. Damsté quotes I 3, 106-7 *rura debuit...flavis Hermus transcurrere ripis.* But *ripis* may retain its usual sense here and emulate turns like *torquens flaventis...harenas* (Verg. *G.* III 350, *cf.* Ov. *Met.* XIV 448, *Fast.* VI 226, *Tr.* V 1, 31), 'the Hermus, with its yellow (golden) banks'. Of the other examples which Damsté and Håk. quote, none is more cogent: IV 3, 90-1 *Cinyphius tacente ripa...serpit, Th.* VII 325 *ripis animosus gurges anhelis*, Verg. *A.* IX 105 *pice torrentes atraque voragine ripas*, Sen. *Med.* 763-4 *Hister...compressit undas omnibus ripis.* It is difficult to say whether the bank belongs to the river or to the land. The same difficulty arises with the expression *trans ripam.* Does *ripa* there mean 'water', as Håk. claims? Similarly, we cannot say if the words *margine ripae* (*Th.* IV 703, Ov. *Met.* I 729, *Ep.* 5, 27) must be explained each time as 'the edge of the water', or 'the extreme edge of the shore'. The first explanation is, however, suggested here by Ov. *Met.* V 598 *margine fontis*, see Plin. *Ep.* VIII 8, 6 *villae quae secutae fluminis amoenitatem margini insistunt.* Ov. *Ep.* 25-6 (spurious) vary with *fluviali consita rivo* on 27 *consita margine ripae.*

I would choose this explanation were it not that *niveae* remains difficult: Håk. shows that it can be used for 'ice-cold' (Sen. *Phaed.* 503-4, Mart. VII 32, 11, Sil. IV 533), or perhaps 'clear' (67-8). He opts for the first sense, but the second one seems preferable (see 1-5n.). But the combination of the unusual meaning of *ripae* and the rare use of *niveae* (in whatever sense) seems too much.

In the case of *ripae* 'water', Schäfer's *nitidae* would be good, *cf.* Mart. IV 22, 2 *nitidos...lacus* = IV 22, 8 *perspicuae...aquae.* Or, alternatively, Markland's *rivi* (taken back by him at once) for *ripae*, together with *nivei*, 'clear', would be satisfying. But these solutions offer still more guesswork.

All in all, I am not certain whether the text is corrupt, but I am not able to explain it satisfactorily.

18-20. velox pecorum deus: See 8n., Ov. *Fast.* II 271 *Pana deum pecoris,* 285 *ipse deus velox,* Hor. *Carm.* I 17, 1-2 *velox...Faunus* ('like a mountain goat': Nisbet-H.).

conubia: In the loose sense of *concubitus,* see e.g. Ov. *Met.* I 490 *visaeque cupit conubia Daphnes, TLL* III 814, 48 ff. It is part of the erotic vocabulary like *ardenti* (*OLD* 7) and *suspiria,* see *complexa* 2, *imminere* 20, *petulans* 25, *protervus* 31, *cubilia* 44, *ama, preme* 45, *dominam* 49, *calores* 53, *incubat, amantibus* 55, *amplexus* 56, *tactus* 57, *odit, exclusos, invitat* 61, see for some of these Cancik 1965, 55-6, *Intr.* here under **III.**

The poetic plur. of *conubium* (γαμοί) occurs since Catul. 64, 141 and 158, e.g. Verg. *A.* III 319, IV 213, Ov. *Am.* II 7, 21: Bednara 542, Schink 42-3. *Conubium* occurs only once in St.: *Th.* I 69, *conubia* 24 times.

The regular scansion of the nom./acc. plur. is *cōnūbĭă.* But here and in a number of other cases in St. (III 3, 110, V 3, 241, *Th.* I 245, III 579, VIII 235, XI 216) this would imply synizesis, *cōnūbiā ardēntī,* also in Lucr. III 776. Because this frequent synizesis is improbable, it seems better to assume that *u* is long only when it bears the *ictus,* but that otherwise the scansion is *cōnŭbĭă,* see Austin on Verg. *A.* I 73 and IV 126.

suspiria librat: 'He is balancing his breathing', that is '*anhelitum ex cursu vehementem compescere nititur*' (Barth, followed by Vollm. and Mozl.), rather than '*s'échappent déjà des soupirs*' (Fr., Argenio, Sb., Traglia-Ar.). *TLL* VI 1350, 44 ranges this vs. under the '*usus liberior, de quolibet temperamento*', like *Th.* VIII 288 *puer incerto formidine gaudia librat* where *librare* is also 'to regulate'.

The scene is an imitation of Ov. *Fast.* I 425 ff.: Priapus is going to rape the sleeping nymph: *surgit amans animamque tenens vestigia furtim/ suspenso digitis fert taciturna gradu,/ut tetigit niveae* (see 32) *secreta cubilia nymphae* (= 44), /*ipsa sui flatus ne sonet aura, cavet/et iam finitima corpus librabat in herba,* /433 *ecce...asellus ...edidit...sonos* and the nymph wakes up; see also Ov. *Met.* I 705 *Panaque, cum prensam sibi iam Syringa putaret.*

Here, as in the *Fasti,* Pan tries to moderate his breath in order not to wake up the nymph. Though here he is breathing heavily from running, there is a suggestion of the sighs of longing (Tib. I 6, 35, IV 5, 11, *Met.* I 707) and despair (Prop. II 22, 47, III 8A, 27, Ov. *Am.* II 19, 55) in erotic poetry, *cf.* also *Met.* XIII 739 *referens suspiria,* 'confessing his love'. This is reinforced by *ardenti,* see e.g. Catul. 62, 23 *iuveni ardenti castam donare puellam,* Verg. *A.* IV 101 *ardet amens Dido,* Ov. *Met.* III 426, *Am.* I 9, 33, *TLL* II 485, 20 ff. *passim,* Pichon 88-9, Vorberg under *ardor, ardere.*

Thus the context makes us interpret 'he moderates the panting in his fevered breast' as 'he moderates his breathing, in spite of his excitement'. This is rendered by Rinn's '*rendant* (*sa respiration*) *moins forte,*

mais plus pressée'. St. has originated the expression *suspiria librare* by taking *librabat* from *Fast.* I 429. Markland's *vestigia* is unnecessary.

levis imminet: St. took *imminere* from Ov. *Met.* I 541-2 *tergo...fugacis* (= *Daphnes*) *imminet* (*Apollo*). But here the hunt is over and *imminet* means 'bends over'. However, it is also erotic: Catul. 61, 165-6 *vir...totus immineat tibi*, Arnob. *Contra Nat.* III 25 *iam ferventes...atque imminentes mariti*, perhaps somehow in *Priap.* 2, 21-3 *nec tibi tener puer/patebit ullus † imminente...qui toro/iuvante versat arte mobilem natem* (Lenz).

It is also used for trees: Verg. *Ecl.* 9, 41-2 *populus antro/imminet*, Hor. *Carm.* III 22, 5 *imminens villae pinus*, Sen. *Oed.* 228, *al.*, see *TLL* VII 458, 51-5. Pan foreshadows here the plane-tree which *stagnis incubat* (54-5), *cf.* Cancik 1965, 55.

levis: without (yet) pressing her, like the tree not touching the water (esp. 56-7).

20-30.: The action of Diana, see *Intr.* and 8-34n. The goddess is introduced suddenly (see on *ecce* below). She is pictured as the huntress (20 *citatos*, 22), provided with bow and arrows (27) and surrounded by her throng (23-4). She watches over the chastity of her followers: in the short speech which is the central part of the scene she once again contrasts nymph and Pan, as Virtue and Lust (24-6). It is only in the synthesis of 60-1 that these opposites come together.

20-2. Ecce: Is often used to introduce a new element in a story, or to direct the reader to something different. It is typical for poetry and fictional prose (Petr., Apul.), but it is also employed by Cic. in his letters; it is too pathetic for historic prose, where it is virtually never found, see Chausserie-Laprée 545-8, Austin on Verg. *A.* II 203, Bömer on Ov. *Met.* II 112, *TLL* V^2 24, 41-5 and 29, 55-7, 83-4.

Ov. employs it for surprising his public: e.g. at *Met.* II 441 *ecce choro comitata suo Dictynna*, II 496, 635, III 101, 174, 572, *Fast.* I 433 (on *suspiria librat* above). But he has it also frequently as a start for the action which results from a preceding description, see Bömer on *Fast.* II 711, and *Fast.* I 543, III 285, 741. In III 741 it is prepared by *iamque* (see 19-20 here). This *iam* is often found in historic descriptions (*iam 'd'ouverture'*, see Chausserie-Laprée 497-517) and in poetry, e.g. Verg. *A.* XII 754 *iam iamque tenet* (756 *tum vero*).

Ecce generally stands first in the vs., but see *Met.* II 110-3 *Phaëton.../perspicit, ecce...patefecit...Aurora*, Verg. *A.* XII 650 *ecce per hostes/*.

St. has it 70 (72) times (not 62 as claimed by Mulder at *Th.* II 538, Heuvel at I 76), generally in first position; but in the same metrical position as here: *Silv.* I 2, 3, III 3, 17, IV 1, 15, IV 8, 15, V 5, 8, *Th.* VII

368, VIII 142, 664, X 216, 321, 897, XI 381, 657, see esp. Heuvel *loc. cit.*

advertit: Present tense, like *imminet* (20). The order up to 30 is: present, perfect (*paenituit*), speech, present (*depromit, torquet*), perfect (*emisit, tetigisse*).

citatos advertit...gradus: *Citatos*, because she is hunting. The word adds to the suspense of 19-20, suggesting that she comes in the nick of time. For the expression, see *Th.* X 137 *volucrem gressum citavit*, Liv. VIII 6, 2 *citato gradu*, Luc. VI 82, Sen. *Her.F.* 179, *Her.O.* 513, Claud. *VI cons. Hon.* 510. Similar phrases occur at *Th.* VII 798 *hortantur gradus*, VIII 138, XI 150 *gressus admovit*, Verg. *A.* VI 386 *pedem advertere* (see 10-1n.), Col. X 276 *advertite plantas.*

per iuga septem: The seven hills of Rome, like II 7, 45, *cf.* I 1, 64 *septem...culmina Martis*, IV 3, 26 *septem montibus*, I 2, 191 *septemgeminae Romae*, IV 1, 6-7 *septemgemino.../Roma iugo*, I 5, 23 *septena culmina.* Ovid seems to be the first to use *iugum* for the hills of Rome: *Fast.* III 884 *Aventino...iugo*, VI 218 *Quirinali...iugo.* St. is more allusive here.

For the rhythm of *per iuga semper*, see II 1, 162-5n.

Aventinae...legit vestigia cervae: Both the specific feminine gender and the fact that we are on Mount Caelius now suggest that something more concrete is meant than 'a deer which she started to hunt on the Aventine', as Vollm., Mozl., Clouard, Fr. and Traglia-Ar. explain.

In the first place, a reference is made by St. to the temple of Diana on the Aventine, founded by Servius Tullius according to legend: Liv. I 45 and Ogilvie there, Merlin 203 ff., Wissowa 1912, 247 ff., Fowler 198 ff. Diana is the goddess *par excellence* of the Aventine, *cf.* Hor. *Saec.* 69, Prop. IV 8, 29, Mart. VI 64, 13, VII 18, 3 and 73, 4.

The deer is sacred to Diana, as the most noble animal of the woods, see *RE* VIII 1945 ff., Roscher *Lex.* I 1006-7, *cf.* Ov. *Fast.* I 387-8 *quod semel est...caesa Dianae...cerva* and Bömer. If we want to look for a special meaning for this *cerva* (apart from Ellis' suggestion that Melior's house was opposite the Aventine (1874, 262 ff.), which cannot be proved or disproved), we find that there is no myth which connects Diana/Artemis with a special hind, apart from the one Herakles had to catch. The only other hind connected with her is the one of Capys in Sil. XIII 115 ff. *famula Dianae* (124).

So we must, as a matter of principle, assume that commentators are right, though, personally, I think that St. alludes to something which is irretrievably lost to us. That the Diana of the Aventine was not a huntress (Wissowa 1912, 250 n. 8, *cf.* Roscher *loc. cit.*) is irrelevant to St.

vestigia legit: also in *Th.* IX 171, XII 272, Verg. *A.* IX 393, Ov. *Met.* III 17 *pressoque legit vestigia passu*, Luc. VIII 210, VFl. I 711. The ending *vestigia cervae* occurs also in Ov. *Tr.* V 9, 27.

23-4. Paenituit vidisse: 'The goddess was vexed to see (the scene)'. The construction of *paenitet* with inf. is normal, see *LHSz.* 348, *OLD* 1b, Ov. *Met.* II 49 *paenituit iurasse patrem, Fast.* VI 46-7 *paenituit...Latio supposuisse Samon.* But *deam* is slightly ambiguous. It could theoretically refer to the nymph. However, she is not called divine in this poem, while Diana's action as a *dea ex machina* is underlined by *deam.* She degrades Pan from *pecorum deus* to a mere *foedum pecus.*

Paenitet occurs only in *Th.* III 22 and here in St.

fidas comites: Her throng = *chorus* (26), see *Th.* II 239 *illa suas Cyntho comites agat*, IX 304, 843, XII 125, Ov. *Met.* II 426 *comitum, virgo pars una mearum* = *Callisto, sacri...pars...chori* (*Fast.* II 156), a striking example of punishment for not being *pudica.*

For *chorus*, see *Th.* IV 379 *silvestris regina chori, Silv.* I 3, 77, Ov. *Met.* II 441 (at 20).

conversa: *Th.* XII 195 *tunc ad comites conversa Pelasgas.*

24-6. Speech of Diana: This speech has two remarkable formal characteristics: St. omits a parenthetic verb or phrase to introduce it, like *ait* or *sic dulce profatur voce* (I 2, 63-4) *etc.* And neither beginning nor end of the speech coincides with the verse.

Only one other speech in the *Silvae* begins without more: I 1, 74-83 (Curtius addresses Domitian)[11]. Six speeches end without an addition like *sic deinde locuta* (26), *sic fata est* (II 7, 105) or the like: I 1, 74-83 again, IV 3, 124-63, V 1, 239-41, V 2, 83-96 and 144-9, V 5, 47-8.

Short speeches, as this one is, frequently miss either an introduction or an epilogue: V 1, 239 ff., V 5, 47 ff., see Verg. *A.* I 437, II 322, IV 702, Sangmeister 49, Sil. II 645 *etc.* On the other hand, this is no fixed rule, see e.g. III 4, 95-97 (*ait, sic ait*), Verg. *A.* II 373-5 (*verbis compellat amicis, dixit*). A small part of all speeches in the Aeneid (8,8%), and apparently in other epics, are not introduced by *ait* or the like, e.g. *A.* II 577 ff., 657 ff., VI 755 ff., VIII 292[12], VFl. I 723 ff., esp. Sangmeister 49-54, 72, 124-7, see Sil. IV 659 *attollit cum voce caput.* In St.: *Th.* I 497 (with Heuvel), II 356, 415 (with Mulder), 546, *Ach.* I 61, *al.* A similar device consists in omitting intervening narrative in a dialogue: Verg. *A.* VI 719 (Servius: *nova brevitas*, see Sangmeister 52-3), VFl. V 292 ff., *Th.* XI 258, 259, 260, see Lipscomb 37-8.

---

[11] I do not count as speeches: II 4, 22-37, III 2, 1-49 and III 4, 1-20 (those two poems begin with a prayer by St., set off from the rest of the poem in III 2, 50 by *audimur*, not clearly distinguished from the rest in III 4). On the other hand, I include IV 4, 12-77, Sts.' words to the letter to Marcellus. See *Appendix.*

[12] Data about speeches in the Aeneid are based on Highet and Sangmeister. Sangmeister apparently does not know Highet's work. Her numbers for speeches, also in Lucan and Silius, differ from other predecessors', like Lipscomb.

In the two speeches in the *Silvae* which begin without more, there is a certain preparation: *mox praeside viso* (I 1, 73), *conversa...ad comites* here, see Sangmeister 43 ff. and esp. 49.

Lucan very rarely opens a speech in this way (2,4% of what Sangmeister calls *Elliptische Redeindikatoren* against 13,2% in the Aeneid and 2,4% of what she calls *Nullform* against 8,8% in the Aeneid). Silius prefers the 'elliptical' opening of a speech (17,3%), but rarely begins it without more (4,4%), see Sangmeister 70-2, 115 ff., 124 ff. The two speeches in the *Silvae* represent 9% of the total, but the numbers are too small for extrapolation.

A general explanation of instances where a *verbum dicendi* is omitted, seems to be that it is clear from the situation that someone is going to speak (frequently in prayers, e.g. Verg. *A.* I 731 ff.) or that the author wants to introduce an element of unexpectedness. Both things are the case here, *cf.* Sangmeister 52 (on the Aeneid) '*Alle genannten Szenen sind von Eile oder einer plötzlichen Wende geprägt; der Ausfall des Verbs des Sagens liesse sich rechtfertigen*'.

In Greek epic, speeches virtually never begin or end within the verse. Roman epic departed from this convention since Enn. (*Ann.* 45, III 394 V.) and esp. Vergil. In later epic this freedom becomes more extended. See Norden on *A.* VI 45, Lipscomb 36-7, Mulder on *Th.* II 176, Smolenaars on *Th.* VII 6. Of all epic poets St. most frequently begins a speech within the verse: 45% (127 out of 280 speeches in the Thebaid). He is followed by Sil. (41%), VFl. (36%) and Luc. (35%), against 25% in the Aeneid. In the number of speeches ending within the verse St. is surpassed by Luc.: 61% in Luc., 43% in St., 25% in Sil., 21% in VFl. and 24% in Verg. See Lipscomb 36-7.

In the *Silv.* 7 out of the 22 speeches begin within the verse, which is 32%: I 4, 61 ff., here, II 7, 41 ff. (hendecasyllables), III 3, 182 ff., III 4, 32 ff., V 1, 239 ff., V 5, 47 ff.

Four speeches end within the verse (18%): I 2, 140, 26 here, III 1, 116 and III 4, 45. Two speeches both begin and end within the verse: this one and III 4, 32-35. It will have been noted that these proportions are lower than those in Sts.' and others' epics, with the exception of speeches beginning within the verse in the Aeneid.

See also II 7, 36-41n. (end) and for a detailed survey of speeches in the *Silvae*, see *Appendix*.

avidis rapinis: 'Lustful rapes'. For *avidus*, 'lustful', see Hor. *Carm.* I 18, 10-1 *fas atque nefas exiguo fine libidinum discernunt avidi*[13].

---

[13] Nisbet-H. construe *avidi* with *libidinum*. This is possible, but not necessary.

Here *avidus* is not said of the god himself, but transferred to the action of the lustful Pan, *cf.* Lucr. I 36 *avidos...visus* and Ov. *Ep.* 9, 161 *avidum...pectus*, both half-way to this use, and *TLL* II 1427, 25 ff., Hey 111. Compare *Th.* IV 695-6: Bacchus promises the nymphs *nocturnaque turba licentum/cornipedum et cupidas Faunorum arcebo rapinas*, Prop. I 20, 11 *nympharum semper cupidas defende rapinas*, see also *Silv.* I 6, 16 *largis... rapinis.*

petulans foedumque pecus: 'Wanton and foul goat'. For *petulans* pertaining to sexual behaviour: Ov. *Ars* I 767 *si doctus videare rudi, petulansve pudenti* (see *pudici* here), Varro in Non. p. 247 (L.), Cic. *Parad.* 20, *Phil.* 3, 35, *Q. Fr.* II 4, 22, Plin. *Nat.* XXXV 72, Petr. 138, 6, Apul. *Met.* V 23, 3 *patulis ac petulantibus saviis, Apol.* 9. *Pecus* would be more or less neutral without this qualification, see *Th.* VI 112 *Pales...Silvanus... semideumque pecus.*

decrescet mihi turba chori: *Decrescit*: M, *decrescet*: A Qm Bσ, printed by all edd.: the parallelism of *nunquam...semper* implies that of *arcebo* and *decrescet.* Diana suggests that her followers will be removed from the throng if they are not *pudicae* anymore.

pudicus does not always refer to regard for the decencies in sexual or other behaviour: *pudor* can be lost unwillingly, 'chastity', see *Ach.* I 671-3 (Deidamea is raped in her sleep by Achilles) *illa astu tacito raptumque pudorem/turgentemque uterum...occuluit*, Ov. *Met.* VI 616-7 *quae tibi membra pudorem abstulerunt ferro rapiam* (Procne to Philomela, who is raped by Tereus), Cic. *Leg.* I 51 *possumus eos, qui a stupro arcentur infamiae metu, pudicos dicere, OLD* under *pudicus* 1, under *pudor* 2b.

turba chori: *Chori* is an epexegetical gen., like *Th.* XI 370 *utraque gentis turba.* Contrast the use in *turba Nereos* (*Th.* III 409), *tua turba* (I 2, 70).

26-30.: Diana acts at last, by throwing an arrow at the Naiad to wake her. St. continues to retard the story (as he did by inserting the speech), by giving a circumstantial description in one long sentence. Only with *Naidos* (30) he returns to the nymph, who has lain there threatened by the panting Pan for 10 lines. In his broad description, St. employs some epic turns (*deinde depromit*, see also *fertur*).

Sic deinde locuta: 'After these words'. The phrase is Vergilian: *A.* V 14, 303, 400; always in the same position in the line. There seems no reason to call this 'postponing of *deinde*' (Williams on V 14), since *deinde* is found as the second word of its sentence about as often as it is the first: see *TLL* V¹ 406, 43-4.

deinde is bisyllabic in all Latin poetry up to Opt. Porf. (*TLL loc. cit.* 69 ff.). St. no exception, *cf.* O. Mueller 1861, 13-4.

depromit pharetra telum: *Depromere* is not found elsewhere in St., who here again leans to Vergilian (and epic) use: *A.* V 501 *depromunt tela pharetris*, XI 590 *pharetra deprome sagittam*, 858-9, *Ciris* 160 *depromens tela pharetra.*

Telum = 'arrow' occurs very often, e.g. *Th.* I 70, II 237, Verg. *A.* V 520, Ov. *Ars* 169[14].

neque: St. conforms to the general practice of Tib., Prop., Ov., the elderly Hor. and later poets, to use *nec* as the normal form, *neque* as the exception: see Axelson 115 ff., esp. 118. O. Mueller (1861, 12-3, and 1863, 195-6) formulated the following rule: St. has antevocalic *neque* only in the formula *neque enim*, anteconsonantal *neque* in the first foot, to form a dactyl, and in the second foot before monosyllables.

This *neque* is the only exception to this rule, because St. was '*necessitate quinti pedis coactus*' (Mueller 1861, 13). In three other places, however, the mss. read *neque* followed by a vowel: *Th.* I 371, II 549, IV 149. Mueller wanted to correct those. But the readings may be right: earlier poets are not dogmatic in their use of *nec* instead of *neque* before vowels, see Axelson 118 and Heuvel on *Th.* I 222.

In his avoidance of anteconsonantal *neque* outside the first foot St. works along the lines of his predecessors: Prop. has it once in the 4th foot, 5 times in the first one, Ovid only 5 times not in the first foot, Horace in the Epistles only once in the 3rd foot, 4 times in the first one, once in the second one before a monosyllable and 5 times in the fifth foot. The use of *neque* in the fifth foot is common to Hor. and St. (though in St. it is more exceptional); and so is the rule of its use before a monosyllable in the second foot (not in Prop. or Ov.; Axelson does not seem to know Mueller's theory), though here St. stretches the point (5 times).

neque...cornibus aut...stridore, sed...emisit...manu: Diana does not use her bow for two reasons: she does not want to alert Pan by the noise (28 *stridore*) and secondly she cannot shoot an arrow so that it will hit the Naiad with its feathers instead of its point (*aversa...sagitta* = the reverse side of the arrow 30), which indicates that she does not want to hurt her.

flexis cornibus aut...stridore: 'With her bent bow or the usual hissing'. *Flexus* is adjectival here, *cf.* Cic. *Arat.* 325 *flexum arcum, Ach.* II 134 *flexae habenae.*

For *torquet*, see e.g. *Th.* IV 325 *ni curvato torsissem spicula cornu.*

stridore of the arrow rather than of the string, see *Th.* IV 428 *stridore sagittae*, VII 416 *stridentia saxa*, X 536 *stridentia tela.* There seems to be only one case where *stridor/stridere* is said of the bow, rather than of a missile:

---

[14] The Concordance puts III 1, 117 *tela/telae* under *telum.*

Verg. *A.* V 502-3 *per caelum nervo stridente sagitta...diverberat auras.* It is used once of a sling: Verg. *A.* IX 586. The other 12 instances where Verg. employs it for weapons refer to a missile, see Pease on *A.* IV 185. This is true also for the rare occurrences in Luc. (once) and VFl. (twice).

So Frère's '*sifflement*' is better than Mozley's 'twang' or Clouard's '*sans faire résonner la corde*'.

Bow and arrow are mentioned apart and return in *manu...sagitta.* Note the *s*, *t*, and *r* sounds, which depict the arrow shot from the bow, *cf.* Marouzeau 1935, 28.

una...contenta manu: 'Content (to fling it) with one hand'. Diana also demonstrates her superiority over the hunting Pan. *Una...manu* is *apo koinou* with *contenta* and *emisit.*

For the metrical position of *una...manu*, see II 6, 8-9n.

levamque soporem/Naidos aversa fertur tetigisse sagitta: This is in M (see Fr. *app.*). Most edd. choose either *laevumque soporem* (: σ, printed by Baehr., Postg., Clouard, Fr., Sb. and Traglia) or Krohn's *laevamque soporae* (Vollm., Klotz, Phill., Mozl., Mar., also in Argenio's translation).

The reading of σ was defended by Rothstein (1900, 500) as 'the untimely sleep of the Naiad', an explanation already given by Guyet and Peyrarède in 1658: '*Naidem ipsam infoelici sopore pressam*'[15]. Rothstein and Håk. (69) give good parallels for the combination of *sagitta tetigit* with the abstract *soporem*: III 3, 123 (*Lucina*) *tetigit...labores, Th.* II 124 *undanti perfundit vulnere somnum*, V 119 *sanguine...iuvenum perfundere somnos*[16].

For *laevus sopor* may be compared *Th.* X 79 *intempesta somni dulcedine*, 280 *infelix sopor*, see *Ach.* I 129 *trepidus sopor.*

The most difficult thing is the use of *laevus*: St. employs it almost invariably in the sense of 'left'. Elsewhere it means 'bringing disaster, unfavourable' rather than 'inopportune': *Th.* I 634 *laevus ignis*, II 16, V 307, XI 444, see *TLL* VII^2 892, 40 ff. (*pace* Håk. 69). One could instance, however, Hor. *S.* II 4, 4 *tempore laevo*, Sil. VII 30 *laeva...hora.*

If we would accept *laevam*, it would be a difficulty that there seems to be no parallel for warning someone by touching the hand (thence Slater's *sub aure* for *soporem*, see Verg. *Ecl.* 6, 3-4).

Soporae has also against it that it means 'bringing sleep', rather than 'drowsy', except for VFl. II 221 (see Langen's note there).

That the nymph has fallen asleep is improbable in itself, but topical in these scenes, see 14-7n. and on *fertur* below. *Sopor* occurs twice in the

---

[15] Six years later Barth troubled the discussion by explaining *sopor* as 'temple' (a part of the head), because German '*Schlaf*' means both 'sleep' and 'temple'. This non-existent meaning subsequently entered the dictionaries.

[16] Fr. *app.* adds IV 4, 12, IV 7, 37, V 2, 43, but these are not apt.

story of Silenus' ass, Ov. *Fast.* I 422 *victa sopore* (see 14 here) and 430 *plena soporis erat*, just before the threatened nymph jumps up (though the scene is less improbable there, since it is night).

So I read, with σ, *laevumque soporem.* Saenger's *sopori* 'sc. *aversa*', presumably meaning 'hostile to her sleep', is improbable.

aversa: 'reversed', see *Th.* IX 141-3 *puppis...nequiquam obstante magistro errat et averso redit in vestigia velo*, Plin. *Nat.* VIII 131 (*ursi*) *arborem aversi derepunt, versa lyra* II 1, 27-8 (n.).

fertur: St. stands some distance from the story. Ov. frequently does so, when his story might seem improbable or when something very horrendous comes next, see Bömer on *Met.* III 106 and for the word *fertur* e.g. *Th.* VI 95, Ov. *Fast.* II 91, 255, 271, 289, 551, 631, 847, *Met.* III 252 *ira...fertur satiata Dianae, TLL* VI[1] 552, 16 ff. (since Acc. *trag.* 669). It is also employed by Lucr. and Verg., to imply that a mythological, literary or antiquarian tradition is followed, see Schrijvers 1970, 52 n. 2 (with earlier examples from Greek), Norden on Verg. *A.* VI 14, Austin on Verg. *A.* I 15 (this use is recognized by Bömer *loc. cit.*, but he expands it).

St. employs it here and at III 4, 21-3 (*dicitur... Venus...Pergameos intrasse domos*) in an *aition*, to underline the fictional character of the story, or to excuse himself for an improbable trait (such as *soporem*).

31-4. diem...hostemque...vidit et in fontem...ruit: The nymph sees Pan and jumps into the pool: end of Act one. See *Th.* X 376 *accepit radios et eadem...Hopleus Tydea luce videt*, Ov. *Met.* X 294 *pariter cum caelo vidit amantem.*

protervus: 'Impudent'. It pertains to sexuality and is more than once applied to satyrs: Cic. *Pis.* 66 *nihil libidinosius, nihil protervius, Cael.* 49, Hor. *Ars* 232-3 *matrona...intererit Satyris...pudibunda protervis*, Ov. *Fast.* IV 142 *Satyri, turba proterva, Ep.* 5, 136. It does not occur in Tib. and only once in Prop., but is frequent in Ovid.

niveos ne panderet artus sic tota cum veste ruit: The nymph jumps into the pool fully clothed. Arethusa, on the other hand, jumps out of a pool where she was bathing (Ov. *Met.* V 598). She is threatened by a water-creature (Alpheius), whereas Pholoe flees from a land-creature, who cannot swim (35-7). In both stories *fons* is used at this moment for the first time. Arethusa is naked: *sicut eram, fugio sine vestibus.* Pholoe's reason, *niveos ne panderet artus*, is, as it were, explained by *Met.* V 603 *et quia nuda fui sum visa paratior illi.*

Sic here is the same as *sicut eram* in *Met.* 601 and explained by *tota cum veste.* Markl. objected against this use of *sic* and wrote *sicut erat cum veste ruit*, accepted by Phill. and Saeng. It does not occur elsewhere in the

Silvae but Håk. (70) quotes Cic. *S. Rosc.* 71 *non sic nudos in flumina deicere* (sc. *voluerunt maiores*) and Liv. II 10, 11 *Horatius Cocles sic armatus in Tiberim desiluit, 'ohne jede Veränderung des augenblicklichen Zustandes'*: Landgraf at Cic. *loc. cit.* Håk. draws attention to the fact that in all these three cases *sic* is used for persons jumping into the water. A cognate use seems to be Pers. *prol.* 3 *ut repente sic poeta prodirem.*

Markl. objected also against *tota*, because the nymph could scarcely dive into the water with only part of her clothing. But this ignores the 'hyperbolical' use of *totus* which is frequent in St.: e.g. *Th.* II 288 *tota pressit Discordia dextra*, 561 *toto sanguine nixus*, IX 72 *tota hasta*, Brinkgreve on *Ach.* I 303 *totis...bibit ossibus ignem* (though some of his parallels, esp. from the *Silvae*, are weak), Mulder on *Th.* II 413. Add: I 5, 45 *radiis... totis*, II 2, 70, III 3, 85-6 *toto/intravit Fortuna gradu*, Sen. *Thy.* 495 *venit... Thyestes: venit, et totus quidem.* Here *tota* is used to express the *pudor* of the nymph, *cf.* for the normal situation I 5, 15-7 *deae virides...veste nihil tectae.*

niveos...artus: *niveus* is Sts.' (and Silius') favourite word for 'white'. Its frequent use starts with Ovid. Vergil prefers *albus*, Lucan *candidus* and Valerius Flaccus *candens.* In Ovid *niveus* and *albus* are almost equally frequent, in Seneca *albus, niveus* and *canus*, see André 1949, 387-9. *Niveus* is specific for poetry (*ibid.* 270-1): under the influence of Alexandrian erotic poetry (χιόνεος: Bion 1, 10) it entered Latin love poetry. It is used very often to designate the whiteness of a woman's limbs (André 1949, 324-5): In St. e.g. *Silv.* I 2, 20 *niveos...coniugis artus/*, Catul. 64, 364 *niveos...virginis artus/*, see Ov. *Fast.* I 427 *niveae...nymphae.*

pandere: 'to disclose': *OLD* 5, where this is the only instance with the body as the object.

ima latus implicat alga: M has *una* for *ima*, also in 59 *unos* for *imos. Ima*: σ.

Pholoe enwraps herself with the weed on the bottom because the pool is clear. She fears that Pan, if he followed her (*sequi credens*), would see her, *cf.* Mart. IV 22 *Primos passa toros et adhuc placanda marito/merserat in nitidos se Cleopatra lacus,/dum fugit amplexus. Sed prodidit unda latentem;/lucebat totis cum tegeretur aquis/.*

Similarly fishes hide from a hunting dolphin: *Th.* IX 244-5 *fugit omnis in imos/turba lacus, viridisque metu stipantur in algas.*

implicare aliquid aliqua re since Verg. *A.* IV 148, see *OLD* 2a, *Th.* VI 889 *latus et firmo celer implicat ilia nexu.*

35-61. Act 2: For its division along the same lines as Act 1, see *Intr.* under **IV.** Now that the nymph has disappeared, Pan comes more into the limelight: compare vss. 10-7 with 35 ff. But the tree which Pan plants stands central in this section: it shares the first part of '*Verwicklung*' with

Pan, where the relation between both is not yet fully clear (35-42). It shares the central part with the nymph, where it is addressed and its future relation to the pool and nymph pointed out (43-52). And in the last part the actions of the tree itself are described (52-61). There the whole story is gathered together and the answer to the questions of the first lines of the poem is given. The *aition* ends on a note of reconciliation (*invitat*), but also of frustration and melancholy (*exclusos*).

35-42.: The despair of Pan (35-8) and his solution (39-42) are painted at equal length, both without a break in syntax: *questus...deposuit.* The somewhat comic detail of Pan who never could swim since he was 'a boy', foreshadows the tree which represents him and which also is not able to get into the water.

The planting of the tree touches on the *topos* of the *locus amoenus*: this ideal landscape is characterized, both in literature and in Pompeian murals, by water in some form and a wood, or tree, see Curtius 191 ff., Schönbeck esp. 1-60 (with literature), Bömer on Ov. *Fast.* II 315, Nisbet-H. on Hor. *Carm.* II 3, 9 (literature on p. 53).

Though here we have no real description of the site as such and details which usually are present are missing (a breeze, grass, animals, especially man himself), the combination of tree(s) and water is standing from Homer onward: *Il.* II 305-7 περὶ κρήνην ἱεροὺς κατὰ βωμοὺς...καλῇ ὑπὸ πλατανίστῳ, *Od.* IX 140-1, Schönbeck 28-9. The fountain, pool *etc.* is always sacred, and the domicile of nymphs, especially in Latin literature (Servius on Verg. *A.* VII 84 *nullus enim fons non sacer*, Grimal 420, Schönbeck 9-21), like here.

Schönbeck (8 ff.) draws a sharp line between the bucolic/idyllic and garden-*locus amoenus* on the one hand, and the Dionysiac, uncultivated *locus amoenus* on the other, criticizing Grimal (424) for connecting them (Schönbeck 12). But Grimal has clearly shown a connection between Dionysus and his band and gardens, which is expressed in this poem by Pan, nymph, tree and water (*cf.* 37-8n.); and we could call the *ensemble* in Melior's garden a *locus amoenus* with Dionysiac elements, if perhaps not Dionysiac in a more extended use of the word.

Connected with the *locus amoenus* is the idea of all nature as living and sacred (Schönbeck 2, Grimal esp. *ch.* X, see *Intr.* here). This goes also for trees: Plin. *Nat.* XII 3 *prisco ritu...simplicia rura deo praecellentem arborem dicant*, see e.g. Kiessling-Heinze on Hor. *Carm.* III 22. This concept, which Horace presents in a serious and personal way, is touched upon by St. in a more general and literary manner here, *cf.* I 3, 59-63: the tree is not only an image of Pan, it is devoted by, and therefore to, Pan. On the special role of the plane-tree, see 39-42n.

35. Quid faceret: With the deliberative subj. (originally vulgar, see *LHSz.* 338, 467, Hofmann §§ 3, 121; pathetic, and therefore also occurring in poetry) St. brings us back to Pan, underlined by the reminiscence to *praedae* (20) in *praedo.*

Sts.' use of questions in *Silv.* II concentrates **a)** on the beginning of poems, see II 1, 1-3n., **b)** on funerary poems or themes: (except for II 1, 1 ff., II 4, 1 ff., II 5, 1 ff., already mentioned) II 1, 15-7, 41-8, 52-4, 56-66, 69-70, 96-8, 128-9, 139, 157-62, 166-73, 175, 189-90, 208-9, 212-3, 226, II 6, 17-8, 21, 58-9, 93-5, II 7, 91-2; **c)** a small residue consists of so-called rhetorical formulae (which also occur under **a)** and **b)**, see II 1, 96n., 157-8n., II 2, 64n., 72-5n., II 2, 44-5 *mirer*?, 63-73 *quid referam*?, 98-9 *Quid dicam*, II 3, 6 *Quid rogem*, perhaps II 6, 48-50 (see there), II 7, 79 *Quid*? The only other question in *Silv.* II is Diana's direct question in vss. 24-6 here.

So this is the only time in *Silv.* II when St. employs the 3rd person of the deliberate subj. It is a device of epic poetry, see Verg. *G.* IV 504 *quid faceret? quo se...ferret?, A.* IV 283-4 *quid agat*? (with Pease) = XII 468 = VFl. I 71 = VII 309 = Ov. *Fast.* II 609, *cf.* Claud. *Ruf.* II 14, Paul. Nol. *Carm.* 28, 267, Verg. *A.* 399 *quid faciat*? = Ov. *Met.* I 617 = II 187 = VFl. IV 3 = *Th.* IV 490 = 838 = X 70 = *Ach.* I 665 = II 161. By the rarity of this device in the *Silv.* St. employs a (mock-heroic, I would say) *pathos* here, and points to his (Ovidian) sources.

deceptus: See *Th.* IV 703-4 *deceptum margine ripae/stat pecus*, Ov. *Met.* VII 783 *decipit ora sequentis* (*fera*).

35-7. altis: For the repetition (*altis* 33), see II 1, 128-30n.

hirtae...conscius...pellis...a tenero nandi rudis: Pan does not dare to jump into the pool for two reasons: **1.** he is conscious of his shaggy hide '*quae multam aquam biberet*': Barth. Vollm. claims that *hirtus* is rather used as a characteristic of goats, which never go into the water, but this is improbable, and see Verg. *Ecl.* 3, 96-7 *Tityre, pascentis a flumine reice capellas/ipse, ubi tempus erit, omnis in fonte lavabo.* That the absorbing quality of Pan's hide is meant, is suggested also by Ov. *Met.* IV 729-31 *maduere graves aspergine pennae;/nec bibulis ultra Perseus talaribus ausus/credere.* St. employs the traditional detail (8n., 10-1n.) for his own purposes. **2.** Pan cannot swim. That fauns cannot swim is also implied by II 2, 100-6.

a tenero is a joke, as if the possibility existed that Pan had unlearned to swim. The expression *a tenero* occurs also in Quint. *Inst.* I 2, 18, Silvia 9, 2, Col. I 3, 13, *cf.* many turns like *a teneris annis* (Ov. *Ep.* 4, 25, *Pont.* II 3, 73), *ab adulescentia* (Pl.): *TLL* I 37, 11 ff.

nandi rudis: *rudis* is followed by the gen. since Cic. (*Ver.* 2, 17, *Balb.* 47), an analogy with *imperitus*, see *OLD* 6a, K.-St. I 437. The gerund after

rudis has entered poetry with St., also in *Th.* II 391 *rudis fandi.* There seems to be only one other instance in poetry, the imitation by Aus. *Mos.* 183 *rudibus natandi Satyris.* The gerund with *rudis* is first used by Curt. IV 2, 17. Though *LHSz.* (375) ascribe the construction also to Vell. and Sen. phil., the only other passage where it occurs according to material from *TLL* is Tac. *Ann.* I 29, 1.

37-8. Omnia questus, immitem Bromium, stagna invida et invida tela: 'He complains of everything: heartless Bromius, the jealous water and the jealous arrow'. The reference to *Bromius* = Dionysus (II 2, 4-5n.) has originated many conjectures and interpretations. The most popular emendation is *Brimo* (Scaliger at Prop. II 2, 64), accepted by Baehr., earlier edd. and Clouard. *Brimo* is only known as Greek Βρίμω (*Schol.* Ap. Rhod. III 861). It is a designation of Diana/Hecate. But she is already referred to by *tela.* This applies also to Lundstroem's *Bromiam* (68) and Sandstroem's *Triviam* (21). Phill. prints his own *irrita membrorum*, and Saenger his own *Pholoen.*

Bromius is quite in place here: Pan is a follower of Dionysus and so accuses him of cruelty in not letting him have the nymph. This was already noted by Domitius, thus also Vollm., Fr. But, as far as I can see, the relation between Pan, nymphs and Dionysus has only been stated as such. For this relation, *cf.* e.g. Grimal 319 ff. and Lucianus *Bis accusatus* 9 ἀγνοεῖς τὸν Πάνα τῶν Διονύσου θεραπόντων τὸν βακχικώτατον, abundant documentation in Borgeaud 66, 75, 86, 128 n. 64, 141, esp. 168-71, 191 n. 72, 204, 249-50, 259-60. In *CE* 1233 (3rd cent. A.D.) the dead boy dances in Elysium with nymphs, fauns and the mystae of Bromius, *cf.* Pikhaus n. 533 bis. The relation becomes still more explicit if we remember that St. has already pointed to *Th.* IV 695-6 (24-6n. *avidis*) where Dionysus is promising the nymphs to protect them from Fauns, *cf.* also 703 there *margine ripae/* = vs. 17 here.

Mitis (*immitem* here) is often used in the invocation of deities (Bömer on Ov. *Met.* I 380), also for Bacchus ('*entgegen der communis opinio*': Bömer on *Fast.* III 789. It is not in Carter); see Ov. *Met.* IV 31, XI 134, *Fast. loc. cit.* So conjectures for *Bromius* are superfluous.

questus...invida...invida: Pan exploits the *topos* of the envy of the gods, see II 1, 120-4n. He sees the pool and the arrows also as living beings in a way, see *TLL* VII^2 211, 6 '*De rebus quae quodammodo sensu praeditae esse putantur*'. For the repetition of *invida*, see II 1, 38-9n.

tela: the poetic plur. (*telum* 27) is frequent since Verg. (*A.* II 216, V 513, *al.*), see Schink 127-8. Here St. wants to avoid *īnvĭdūm.*

39-42. primaevam visu platanum...deposuit: When Pan and Silvanus are considered as interchangeable (8-9n.), Pan can be a planter of trees:

Silvanus was considered as the god of woods, e.g. *Th.* VI 111 *Silvanusque arbiter umbrae* (Lactantius: *id est dominus silvarum*). He is depicted with a pine branch or a deracinated tree, see 2 *RE* III 118, Richter on Verg. *G.* I 20 (that the poets were wrong in this, according to *RE*, is irrelevant).

It is difficult to say if *visu* is a supine or an abl. of respect. But I think Vollm. is wrong in explaining it as '*wie er sie gerade sah*', followed by Mozl., Clouard, Fr., Argenio and Sb. The word order strongly suggests that we should take *primaevam visu* together, '*giovane a vedersi*' (Traglia-Aricò), 'young to see'. There exist few lists of adjectives which can have a supine with them, see Håk. 76 and II 6, 42 *qualis visu* (n.). It may be paralleled by *Ach.* I 161 *dulcis adhuc visu*, V 3, 70 *miserabile visu.* It is improbable that Sts.' contemporaries wondered what kind of abl. this is.

The plane-tree is one of the most popular trees of antiquity and very frequent in the *locus amoenus*, see Hom. *Il.* II 305-7 (35-42n. above). It is the tree where Socrates sits down in the *Phaedrus* (230b), and many famous very great specimens were known in antiquity, see Hehn 234-40, *RE* XX[2] 2337-8, Plin. *Nat.* XII 9 *fontis gelidi socia amoenitate*, XVI 240.

In Latin literature the *platanus* is sometimes a symbol of the idyllic landscape (Ov. *Met.* X 90-106, *cf.* Schönbeck 50 n. 4, '*die bukolische Platanus*': Pöschl 20). Philitas of Cos composed his poems under a plane-tree (Pöschl 15).

Sometimes it is considered as a sign of luxury, because it bears no fruit: Hor. *Carm.* II 15 *caelebs platanus* ('sterile'), *Nux* 17 ff. *platanis sterilem praebentibus umbram...nos quoque frugiferae.*

It was imported relatively late into Italy (Grimal 394). For its use in gardens, see also Sen. *Con.* V 5, Plin. *Nat.* XII 13, Mart. III 58, 3, IX 61, 6, Plin. *Ep.* V 6, 20 and 32, Grimal 275, 440, 461 n° 69, Nisbet-H. on Hor. *Carm.* II 11, 13 and II 15, 4. For the care and planning involved for the Romans in planting trees, see also Nisbet-H. on Hor. *Carm.* II 13, 2.

cui longa propago innumeraeque manus et iturus in aethera vertex: A zeugma for *cui longa propago* (*futura*) *innumeraeque manus* (*futurae*) *et iturus in aethera vertex.* Clouard seems to be the only one to explain thus explicitly: '*un jeune platane à qui sont promises vaste envergure et forêt de bras, et qui touchera le ciel de son front*'. Differently Mozl.: 'a young plane-tree with long stem *etc.*', Fr.: '*un tout jeune platane de belle pousse etc.*', also Argenio, Sb., Traglia-Ar. The zeugma gives *primaevam visu* its point, and *longa, innumerae* would be strangely inconsistent with *iturus...vertex* otherwise. Moreover it is highly improbable that the tree could be replaced if it was already so big, or that Sts.' contemporaries could have thought so. This fits also better the idea implied in 53 ff., that the tree is still growing a great deal.

For the zeugma, see e.g. II 1, 10-1 and Vollm., II 6, 62, Vollmer's index under zeugmata, also II 2, 133-9n.

The use of *manus* and *vertex* points already to the identification of Pan and the tree, and so does *primaevus*, which is virtually only said of human beings (*OLD*): *vertex* is not unusual both for human beings and trees (e.g. Verg. *A.* III 679-80 (oak and cypress), Ov. *Met.* X 103 (pine-tree)). *Manus*, however, is extremely rare for trees: *TLL* VIII 366, 32 ff. gives only 3 instances: this line, Sen. *Her. O.* 1625 (*quercus*) *ultra...totos porrigit ramos manus* (where other mss. read *nemus* and a corruption seems to hide) and Pallad. XV 60. So Vollm. is misleading when he says '*die sonst übliche Übertragung für Zweige*'. *Bracchium* is more normal in this context, but St. purposely chooses a new word to underline the personification of the tree, see also on 45 *preme frondibus*, 53-7, 60-1, 72 *florens*, 77 *revirescet.*

Trees had a symbolic function sometimes: they were planted near the grave as a symbol of immortality or planted at someone's birth. The emperor's *numen* could influence them. In other contexts they are connected with human beings: they belong to the family (e.g. Plin. *Nat.* XV 35, Tac. *Hist.* II 78), see *RLAC* II 18-9; for other symbolic interpretations, see Pöschl (on Ov. *Met.* XI 90 ff.).

Trees frequently appear in comparisons with human beings, see *Th.* IX 585 ff., where Parthenopaeus' mother foresees his death because she dreams that his favourite oak is dying, *Th.* VI 774, VIII 544, IX 532, Vessey 1973 n. 1, Legras 1905, 299. Vergil compares trees to human beings in the Georgics (e.g. II 279 ff., 340-1, *cf.* 367-70). In *A.* IV 441 ff. he compares Aeneas to a falling oak, a simile with Greek prototypes, see Hom. *Il.* V 560 ff., XIII 389 ff., Ap. Rhod. III 967 ff., IV 1680 ff., also Catul. 64, 105 and Pease's note on *A.* IV 441, Sen. *Dial.* I 4, 16, *Ep.* 76, 9-10 and 87, 19, *RLAC loc. cit.* The most extended use of the equalization man/tree is, of course, found in Ovid's *Met.* Its exploitation culminates in Palladius, see Cancik 1965, 55, Svennung 75.

propago: 'stem' (Mozl.), rather than 'the leafy shoots' (*OLD* 1c, where this is the only instance), see *ardua* (4). Otherwise *propago* would be the same thing as *manus.*

deposuit: 'Planted', see Verg. *G.* II 23-4 *plantas...deposuit sulcis*, Ov. *Rem.* 193, Plin. *Nat.* XIX 6 *semine seri...non deponi, OLD* 5a.

vivamque adgessit harenam: *Vivam* is strange. Fr. translates it as '*vivifiant*', followed by Sb. and Traglia-Ar. But that meaning of *vivus* has no parallel.

When *vivus* is not used of human beings, it refers to water or to trees and the like. Or in other contexts it means 'natural, not man-made', see Verg. *A.* I 167 and Austin, Ov. *Fast.* II 315 and Bömer (see however II 1, 131-5n. for another strange use, and *cf.* II 1, 2n.). Its use of water

prompts Vollmer's (after Barth) 'still wet, fresh', followed by Mozl., and Clouard. This seems the best explanation, though 'wet' is also said in *aquis.*

Another solution would be to write *niveam* instead of *vivam.* This should also explain 17, see 14-7n.

For *adgessit,* see Mart. VIII 67, 4 *aggesta contumulavit humo.*

optatis...aquis: The water which the tree needs. But also 'the water (where the nymph was hidden) which Pan desires'. Thus Alpheius in Ov. *Met.* V 636-7 *cognoscit amatas...aquas.* See also II 1, 56-7n. By sprinkling the tree with water from the pool the desired contact is made.

talia mandat: An epic formula: *Th.* VII 76 = Verg. *A.* IV 222, see Pease on *A.* IV 30, *Intr.* here.

43-52.: The wishes and commands of Pan: he clearly treats the tree as a substitute for himself (*tu saltem...ama* 45) and the pool as if it were the nymph (46-8), stressed by the sexual ambiguities in *preme* 45, *turbare* 48. This is elaborated in 53 ff.

Secondly, the tree is wished (43) and promised (49 ff.) a long life: this not only means that it was old when St. described it, but it may also point forward to the immense age it will perhaps reach through Sts.' poetry (62-3). If Sts.' poem, and thereby its subject, the tree, will live, this assures the addressee, Atedius Melior, of lasting fame also: so St. not only gives the usual wishes for long life (72 ff.) on Melior's birthday, but by the nature of his present goes some way to realise those wishes (see below on 62 ff.). Thus by stressing the long life of the tree he connects the *aition* and the *genethliacon,* see *Intr.*

Wishes for the life of a tree are sometimes found in connection with the use to write love poetry or the name of the beloved into trees: Verg. *Ecl.* 5, 13-4 and 10, 53-4, Ov. *Ep.* 10, 27-8, Calp. *Ecl.* 1, 20-5. St. may vary on this *topos* here (see *ama* 45 and vs. 43 reminds of Ov. *Ep.* 10, 27 *Populus, vive, precor.* But the reminiscence is slight and may be fortuitous: the context is wholly different). But the poem dedicating a tree to a god (Verg. *Cat. frg.* 1 *hunc lucum tibi dedico consecroque, Priape* and Hor. *Carm.* III 22) does hardly come into the question here.

43-5.: pignus memorabile voti: A remarkable proof, a monument worthy to live in memory and stories. *Voti* depends on *pignus* rather than on *memorabile,* 'reminding of', for *memorabile* + gen. is not found (see III 5, 98, Luc. IX 994 *pignus memorabile).*

pignus voti: 'an assurance, proof, of my vow'. Pan promises to protect the tree and the nymph as long as the tree loves the pool/nymph (49 ff.). The tree will be the visible proof of this vow.

durae...cubilia nymphae: The phrase is imitated from Ov. *Fast.* I 427 *ut tetigit niveae secreta cubilia nymphae* (see 30-4n.). But St. stresses the sexual aspect by his use of *cubilia*, for in Ovid the nymph is sleeping.

dura occurs often in love poetry for the pitiless girl, e.g. Hor. *Carm.* III 7, 32, Tib. II 6, 28, Prop. II 22, 43, *OLD* 5b, see *Intr.* under **III.**

latebrosus: Occurs only here in St., *secreta* in Ovid, 'hidden', *cf.* Verg. *A.* VIII 713 *latebrosa...flumina* (sc. *Nili*), Sen. *Tro.* 823 (*Mothone*) *quae sub Oetaeis latebrosa silvis*, perhaps *Oed.* 152 *latebrosa serpens. TLL* VII² 994, 61 ff. explains all other instances of the word as *latebrarum plenus* or *fallax* or *obscurus* (of speech).

tu saltem: See *Th.* I 79-81 *videt...deorum...genitor? tu* (= Tisiphone) *saltem...huc ades, Ach.* I 949-54 *duc comitem...attamen hunc...hunc saltem sub corde tene.*

declinis: According to Mar., M has *declinis*, and γ *declivis* (*Add.* p. 144, see also Baehr. and Phill. *app.*). But Traglia (*app.*) states that M has *declivis.* Others are silent, but everyone prints *declinis*, except for Clouard.

The two words are often confused, e.g. Luc. IV 427, Calp. *Ecl.* 1, 1 and 5, 60. The difference is explained by Isid. *diff.app.* 85 *inter decline et declive hoc interest quod declinus* (sic) *sol, declivus* (sic) *locus*, see *TLL* V¹ 196, 26-7. *Declivis* is the most frequent word of the two, but here *declinis* is right, *cf.* III 3, 128 *declinant lilia culmos.*

cubilia...ama, preme: Markl. wished to write *ama et*, but for the asyndeton see I 3, 25-6, V 3, 147, 279-80, *Th.* X 299; the other vss. adduced by Vollm. on I 2, 38 are different, but *cf.* also II 1, 21, 39, 50-1, 87-8, 93, 100 *etc.*

The asyndeton, by its immediate association of *ama* with *preme*, stresses the sexual meaning of *premere*, 'to have intercourse with', see Prop. I 13, 22 and Enk's note, Verg. *Cat.* 6, 4 with Westendorp Boerma, [Sen.] *Oct.* 704, VFl. VIII 256 *Hister anhelantem Peucen...presserat*, Mart. III 58, 17, IV 4, 4 *pressa piger hircus in capella*, Suet. *Cal.* 25 *Noli uxorem meam premere, OLD* 2b, Cancik 1965, 55, Vorberg *s.v.*

So *preme frondibus undam* both means 'handle the water with your leaves' and 'obscure', 'overshadow', see *OLD* 17, Plin. *Ep.* V 6, 38 *lumen obscurum umbra premente. Nam laetissima vitis...nititur*, also Sen. *Nat.* II 56, 1 *Nisi illum Ciceronis umbra pressisset*, Cancik 1965 *loc. cit.*[17].

46-8. meruit: Sc. *igne aestuari et grandine feriri.* Perhaps this is an allusion to burning (see *OLD ignis* 3c) and flogging as a punishment. The tree must protect the pool against the scorching sun and the slashing hail with

[17] But I think that his references to Ter. *Ph.* 1018, Hor. *Ep.* I 12, 18 and Sen. *Her.F.* 1078 rather confuse the issue.

its leaves: it is the only one who may touch the pool (*tantum* goes both with *memento* and with *tu*), with its leaves (48).

Meruit is spoken from Pan's point of view: she deserves punishment for refusing him. Apollo is more forgiving to Daphne (*Met.* I 557 ff.).

igne superno aestuet: *Supernus* is 'of heaven', like *Th.* VIII 315-6 *astrigerumque domos Atlanta supernas/ferre laborantem*, Ov. *Met.* XV 128 *numen supernum* = Iuppiter, Luc. VI 430-1 *supernis deis*, IX 556-7.

For *ignis*, see II 1, 215-7n., *Th.* IV 748 *igne poli, OLD* 4a. There is no exact parallel for *supernus ignis*, sun, but *cf.* the use of *aerius*: *TLL* VII 290, 29 ff.

aestuare: 'to burn, be hot', see I 3, 8 *Pisaeum domus non aestuat annum*, Verg. *G.* I 107 *ager aestuat*, Luc, I 16.

grandine dura: *dira*: Schrader, accepted by Baehr., Phill., probably because of Hor. *Carm.* I 2, 1-2 *dirae/grandinis*, but there 'the word suggests a sinister omen' (Nisbet-H.). Here it means 'harsh', see *Priap.* 65, 5 *grandine verberata dura* and the combinations *frigus durum, hiems dura* (Pl. *Men.* 975, Cic. *Scaur.* 25, see *OLD* 8c), *cf.* also Verg. *G.* 449 *horrida grando*, Hor. *Carm.* III 1, 29 *verberatae grandine vineae.*

The *nympha dura* would deserve to be beaten by the *grando dura.* For the two different senses of *durus* within a few lines, see II 1, 47-8n., 169-72n., II 2, 68-72n. II 7, 20n.

For *precor*, see on II 6, 103.

spargere...laticem et foliis turbare memento: *Foliis* is *apo koinou* with *spargere* and *turbare.* The tree sprinkling the water with its leaves is an allusion to the *paraklausithuron*, see e.g. Ov. *Am.* I 6, 67-8 *at tu non laetis detracta corona capillis/dura super tota limina nocte iace, Ars* III 72 *sparsa nec invenies limina mane rosa*, Tib. I 2, 13-4 with Smith's note for other references, Copley 1-3, 33 n. 18, 95, 131 n. 13, Nisbet-H. I pp. 290-1. The allusion is made explicit in *exclusos* 61, alluding to the term *exclusus amator* (Lucr. IV 1177), *cf.* e.g. Plin. *Ep.* VII 5, 1 and Copley 140 for references to the use of the *topos* in Flavian times.

laticem occurs only here in the *Silv.* (the sing. only here, the plur. 3 times in the *Th.*). The word occurs since Acc. *trag.* 66 and is mainly poetic: Bömer on Ov. *Met.* III 171.

turbare: see II 2, 40. Perhaps it is a play on erotic disturbances, *cf.* Ov. Ars II 563 *insano Veneris turbatus amore.*

memento with inf. occurs since Pl., mainly in poetry and epistolary literature (Cic. *Att.* V 9, 2, Sen. *Ep.* 24, 12, Plin. *Ep.* V 16, 10). It stands always at the end of the hexameter in dactylic poetry, mostly with the inf. immediately before it, see Mulder on *Th.* II 701 and *LHSz.* 356. Its last position is invariable in St., but the inf. precedes it immediately in only 3 cases out of 6.

49-50. Tunc: *Tunc* is far more frequent in St. than *tum* (about 4 to 1 in more than 200 instances of both taken together). According to *LHSz.* (520) the relation in Catullus is *tunc* 1/*tum* 28, Hor. 5:15, Prop. 13:39, Ov. *Met.* 13:33, Phaed. 22:28, Sil. I-V 11:62. Only in Martial (18:2) and Persius (10:1) *tunc* is more frequent.

Sts.' use shows that this predilection for *tunc* is unconnected with *genre.* (The proportion in the *Silvae* is about equal to that in the epics: *tunc* 26, *tum* 7). The same is true for post-Augustan prose (*LHSz. loc. cit.*). St. apparently develops a tendency which was already existent. That he does not draw on contemporary prose, (*cf.* II 6, 101n.), is shown by the predilection of Quint. and Tac. for *tum.* If metrical advantage was a reason, that has apparently not been strong enough for other poets.

recolam: Translations differ widely: 'I will long remember' (Mozl., Fr.), '*je veillerai*' (Clouard), '*io ti concederò un lungo culto*' (Sb., similarly Argenio, Traglia-Ar.). *OLD* (4) puts it under 'to go over in one's mind'.

St. himself employs *recolere* two more times: *Th.* I 666-7 *haec sacra quotannis sollemnes recolunt epulae* and IV 723 *atra sacrum recolit trieteris Ophelten.* In both cases it means 'to renew the worship of, one's cultivation of' (*OLD* 3c), though the object is different, the ceremony in *Th.* X, the person in *Th.* IV. This interpretation seems apt here too, the more so since for *recolere* 'to recall' *OLD* (4) gives only instances with ACI following, or absolutely used. We may explain *recolere* here simply as 'to cultivate', without the implication of renewal. But we may also assume that there is a yearly sacrifice to the tree and the *domina sedis*, as in Hor. *Carm.* III 22, perhaps on Melior's birthday.

dominam...sedis: 'The tutelary deity of the site', *cf.* Catul. 35, 14 *Dindymi dominam.* But *domina* is also a word taken from the love elegy, e.g. Tib. II 3, 5, Prop. I 1, 21, see *OLD* 3b.

benignae: Of places: III 1, 150-1 *Parthenope benigna, Th.* XII 620 *Parnesque benignus vitibus*, Tib. I 3, 62, see *Silv.* IV 3, 45 *maligna sedis*, IV 3, 29 *maligna tellus. Benigna*, 'liberal with its beauty', is almost equal to *amoenus* here, see II 2, 31-3n.

inlaesa tutabor utramque senecta: Pan promises old age free from care, like St. wishes a long life for Melior with a youthful mind (72-3), *cf.* III 1, 171-4 esp. 174 *teque nihil laesum viridi renovabo senecta.* The concept that nymphs become old and can even die also occurs at I 3, 63 *non abruptos tibi debet Hamadryas annos*[18], *Th.* VI 94-6 (a very old tree) *Nymphas etiam mutasse superstes Faunorumque greges* (*fertur*). But in 51-2 only the tree is admired.

---

[18] For the reading, see Willis 318.

Both *tutari* and *inlaesus* do not occur elsewhere in the *Silv.* (though the former is used twice, the latter three times in the Thebaid, see *Intr.* under **I.** for Sts.' epic language here).

51-2. ut...stupeant tua germina: 'So that all trees will be surprised at your boughs'. For *stupere*, see II 1, 113-9n. For *germen*, see Plin. *Nat.* XIII 58 *haec germen emittit sine ullis foliis.*

Iovis...frondes: The oak, see e.g. Verg. *G.* III 332, *A.* III 680, Ov. *Met.* I 106, VII 623, *RE* V 2051-2 (*Eiche*).

Phoebi frondes: The bay, see Bömer on Ov. *Met.* I 452 ff., 558 ff., *Fast.* III 139, Hor. *Carm.* II 7, 19 and 15, 9 (both with Nisbet-H., who say at 15, 9 'a constant feature of elegant gardens'), *RE* XIII^2 1439-42.

The oak and the bay both reach a great age, see Plin. *Nat.* XVI 6, 234-40. But here they are mentioned mainly as venerable attributes of a god. Pan puts his own tree (*pinus*, which was not famous for its longevity) as a climax of the series.

discolor umbra populus[19]**:** *Discolor* is 'of two colours', see Plin. *Nat.* XVI 86 *alba* (sc. *populus*) *folio bicolor, superne candicans, inferiore parte viridi.* Two colours are meant also in *Th.* IV 327-8 *maculis...discolor atris...equus,* IX 685 *discolor...tigris.* At *Th.* X 119 *discolor virgo* (= *Iris*) the word means 'multicoloured', like Sen. *Nat.* I 3. At *Th.* IX 338 it means 'different in colour from', see *OLD* 1. The word does not occur elsewhere in the *Silv.* For the high age of the poplar, see Plin. *Nat.* XVI 119 *senescit...tarde...populus.*

The poplar loves growing by water and was often planted in gardens. It is conjoined with the pine already in Homer (*Il.* XIII 389-90, XVI 482-3) and in wall-painting, see Nisbet-H. on Hor. *Carm.* II 3, 9. Here it is mentioned as the tree of Hercules, see III 1, 185 *populeaque movens albentia tempora silva*, Plin. *Nat.* XII 3 *arborum genera numinibus suis dictata... ut...Herculi populus.*

umbra: 'foliage', see II 7, 14, *Th.* IX 592 *viridem...umbram, Ach.* I 212 ff. *volucris...timens qua fronde domum suspendat...tandem placet umbra... ramis...arbor*, Verg. *Ecl.* 5, 5, *G.* I 157 *falce premes umbras*, II 410, *A.* VIII 276 *Herculea bicolor...populus umbra*, Calp. *Ecl.* 5, 101, Sil. IV 681-2, XII 354, Nem. 4, 23 *tenet uva comas...populus umbras*, Cancik 1965, 55, Håk. 160 with n. 64. St. plays on its two meanings in 55, where it means 'shadow/reflection'.

nostrae...pinus: The pine is dedicated to Pan, *cf.* Verg. *Ecl.* 7, 24, Prop. I, 18, 20, Ov. *Met.* XIV 638, *Fast.* V 537, *RE* XX^2 1708-10.

---

[19] The Concordance makes no difference between 'people' and 'poplar'.

St. refers to the stone or parasol pine, which is often present in idyllic landscapes (Theocr. 1, 1 and 5, 49, Ov. *Ars* III 692) and in gardens, e.g. Hor. *Carm.* III 22, see Nisbet-H. on Hor. *Carm.* II 3, 9.

53-61.: The tree. Its identification with Pan is explicit now (53). Of Pan's instructions only those to love the pool are mentioned, not the protecting of 46-7, nor the scattering of its leaves of 47-8. This gives St. the chance to indulge in lexical ambiguities (55-57).

He now comes back to the beginning of his poem, *viz.* the question of the tree's wonderful growth: that originates in the tree's love, which makes it incline to the pool, and in a physical phenomenon (56n.), which makes it grow back straight into the air. The result is a beautiful optic illusion. The *aition* ends with an explicit statement of the ambiguous relation between the tree and the nymph: she invites the branches into the water which they do not reach, see *Intr.* and at 35 ff.

The whole is told in three phases: the tree inclines, its wishes and their frustration, and how it grows upwards again. It ends with a pointed mythological remark, see II 2, 34-5n., 98-106n.

53-4. veteres animata calores: *Animata* is very difficult: Markl. said that *animata calores* should mean *quae animatos calores habet,* comparing constructions like *Ach.* II 178 *caelatum pugnas* (*poculum*), which is equal to *quod caelatas pugnas habet.*

Vollm. and most edd. after him (not Saeng., who obelizes, Clouard and Phill.) explain *animata calores* as a '*kühner Akkusativ des Inhalts*', 'come to life regarding the love'. This is indeed very *kühn,* for no one has offered a parallel for it. Vollm. himself compares Verg. *G.* III 307 *vellera... Tyrios incocta rubores* (which he calls '*genau so*'), but whereas one can say *incoquo ruborem velleribus* (*OLD* 2), one cannot say *calorem animo arbori.* Frère quotes *TLL* II 86, 55 (where this line stands without a parallel), who adduce a fictional Greek example ἐμψυχωθεῖσα τὸν θερμότητα (*LSJ* give only two instances for the passive use of ἐμψυχόω, one undated and one very late). I have found one similar construction, Mart. Cap. I 36 *vivos vultus...signifex animator inspirat,* but I doubt if this carries any weight; *aliquid inspiratus* does not exist.

Elsewhere St. uses *animata in* and/or *animata* with abl., e.g. *Th.* VI 269 *miris in vultum animata figuris* 'images by marvellous sculpturing sprung to life into a likeness'. *Animare* does not occur in Augustan poetry, except for 3 times in Ov. In two instances he has *animare in*: *Met.* IV 619 *humus...animavit in angues* (drops of Medusa's blood), XIV 566 *in nymphas animata classe,* see Bömer on *Met.* I 158. Markl. thought of emending into *dei in veteres animata calores,* but rejected it (see van Dam 393-4). The dif-

ficulty is that this would imply that the tree changes into the living love of Pan, which is probably too much of a metamorphosis.

Merrill (94) construes *illa arbor animata incubat veteres dei calores.* But this construction is impossibly twisted. And even if it was not, I doubt if any one would understand this as 'the inspired tree droops over the god's beloved'.

Markl. proposed *imitata* (Slater 1912, 255 ff. *mentita*), accepted by Rinn., Baehr., Phill. and Clouard. It has parallels in Hor. *Ep.* II 1, 207 *lana...violas imitata*, Ov. *Met.* IX 340 *Tyrios imitata colores.* It could be explained by supposing that *imitata* was first corrupted into *imimata.* But it does not satisfy completely, mainly because both parallels refer to dye, and also because it sounds somewhat lame.

It is preferable to obelize *animata*, as Saenger does.

veteres: 'of old', (as Vollm. says): from the point of view of the present: see I 2, 90 *tu, veteres...transgressus amores*, II 2, 63, III 5, 45 = V 1, 255 *veteres heroidas, etc.*

calores: 'love'; see *Th.* III 701, *Ach.* I 888, *Silv.* I 2, 89, Heuvel on *Th.* I 3, since Verg. *A.* VIII 390, Hor. *Carm.* IV 9 ff., (plur.), see *OLD* 6.

uberibus stagnis obliquo pendula trunco incubat: 'Hanging down over the abundant waters it leans with drooping stem'.

uberibus: 'abundant', *cf.* Ov. *Met.* III 31 *uberibus fecundus aquis*, IX 105, Hor. *Carm.* II 19, 10, *cf.* Ov. *Tr.* IV 10, 3 *Sulmo uberrimus undis.* The word is comparatively rare in Latin poetry: never in Tib. and Luc., once in Prop. and VFl., twice in Verg. and Hor., 7 times in Sil. and 9 in Ov. St. has it only here.

obliquo: 'slanting', 'set at an angle to...a line taken as a standard of reference' (*OLD* 1a, see II 2, 30-1n.), see *Th.* XI 53 *obliquo descendit ab aere vulnus*, Cic. *Arat.* 102 *Orion obliquo corpore nitens.*

pendula: occurs only here and at IV 3, 28 (in a different sense) in St., see *Culex* 52 *pendula proiectis carpuntur...arbuta ramis.*

stagnis...incubat: see I 3, 17-9 *nemora alta citatis/incubuere vadis; fallax responsat imago/frondibus et longas eadem fugit umbra per undas*[20], Sen. *Thy.* 155 *hic illinc gravibus frondibus incubat arbor*, Plin. *Nat.* VI 53 *iugum incubans mari.*

Williams (on *Th.* X 303) says that in *incumbere* the action is stressed and in *incubare* the state. But this distinction seems too fine, see Verg. *A.* II 514 *laurus incumbens arae*, VIII 236 (*silex*) *incumbebat ad amnem*, Sil. XIV 194 *incumbens Messana freto.*

---

[20] The lexica on principle take all forms of *incubui* under *incumbere.* But the similarity between I 3, 17-9 and this line suggests that St. thought of *incubuere* there as the perf. tense of *incubare.*

It is possible that in *incubat* St. alludes to sex again (43-5n., 46-8n., on *tactus* below). Evidence for *incubare* itself in a sexual sense is very rare and suspect: only Mela III 83 (*Phoenix avis*) *sibi incubat*, see *TLL* VIII[1] 1062, 64 ff. But *incubitare* is used by Pl. as 'to sleep with' (*Per.* 284), see *incubuit*: *Ilias* 337, *incubator* in Fulg. *Aet. Mundi* p. 159, 8, 'someone who takes a woman'.

The most interesting words in this connection are *incubus* and *incubo*. These words for a spirit taking possession of women are amply attested in later antiquity, and, what is more, often connected with fauns and satyrs: Serv. on *A.* VI 775 *Inuus, incubo, Faunus, Fatuus, Fatuelus*, Πάν, 'Εφιάλτης, Hier. *Vita Pauli* 8 *accolis eremi, quos...gentilitas Faunos Satyrosque et incubos vocans colit, In Isid.* 13, 20-2, Aug. *Civ.* XV 23, p. 108 16 D, Cledon *Gramm.* V 35, 24, Rut. Nam. I 232-4, Isid. *Orig.* VIII 11, 103, Greg. Magn. *Moral.* VII 36, see Smits 49-61, Borgeaud 119-20 with notes and literature. See, in this connection, also Plin. *Nat.* XXVII 107 (a herb) *cuius radix evulsa vircus hirci redolet. Hac in Piceno a feminis abigunt quos mira persuasione Fatuos vocant.*

It seems that the erotic aspects of these nightly demons like 'Εφιάλτης/Pan are secondary. But I think that St. here plays on an existing sexual meaning of *incubare*, see also *Th.* X 302-3 *tali...deus...umbra/ incubat.*

For the tree standing, as it were, between land and water, see *Th.* IX 492 ff. *Stabat gramineae producta crepidine ripae/undarum ac terrae dubio, sed amicior undis/fraxinus ingentique vadum possederet umbra*, II 1, 148-53n. (*pectoris...reliquias*), II 2, 45-9n.

umbris scrutatur amantibus undas: See at *umbra* (51) above. Earlier edd. (before the *ed. Bipontina* of 1785) often doubted *scrutatur*: Markl. (rightly) contended that it means '*in secreta rei alicuius penetrare*', like sponge-divers do, *scrutatores maris*. And he (wrongly) concludes '*quomodo fieri potest ut scrutentur undas umbrae et simul non tangant*'? But this is exactly the point: the shadow (but not the leaves) searches the waters and makes the tree mirror itself, *cf.* Cancik 1965, 55, 1-5n. above.

For the variation in *stagnis* (54), *undas* (55), *aquarum* (56), *lacus* (60), *gurgite* (61), see 1-5n.

For *amantibus*, see 45 *ama.*

56-7. Sperat et amplexus: Either *et* means *etiam* here (Fr.: '*il va jusqu'à espérer l'étreinte*', Argenio, Sb.), as in II 1, 17, II 6, 4, 5, 54, 104. Or, more probably, I think, it is simply 'and' (Clouard, Mozl., Traglia-Ar.). For the postposition of *et*, see II 2, 81-2n.

For *amplexus*, see *complexa* 2 (and note).

aquarum spiritus: St. mingles in an interesting way the notion of the divine power inhabiting the water with the scientific idea that water originates currents of air, see *Aetna* 315 *flumina parva ferunt auras, vis proxima venti est* and Sudhaus' note, Sen. *Nat.* V 5, 1 *causam venti...aquarum terrarumque evaporationes, Dial.* III 17, 4 *venti...fluminibus paludibusque concepti.*

For *spiritus*, wind, see III 2, 44, Var. *R.* I 57 *vehementior spiritus ventus est, leviter fluens aer.*

St. is often seen as a typically unrealistic, 'literary' poet. Yet he is the only poet to give us a description of the building of a highway, virtually the only surviving literary testimony of it (IV 3), and Cancik has first pointed out that Statian '*Sachlyrik*' is both concrete, exact *and* poetic. This was recognized by Goethe and Hand, but not by the later 19th century, when physics and literature became disjoined (*cf.* Abrams, esp. *Ch.* XI).

Like Lucan and Seneca, St. shows the influence of the science of his time, here and elsewhere: in *Th.* VI 360 ff. Apollo sings a song about natural phenomena (*cf.* esp. 360-1 (*aperit*) *quis sidera ducat/spiritus*), like Vergil's Iopas (*A.* I 740 ff.), though the wording is quite different, showing that St. is not 'merely' imitating Vergil. Vessey (1973, 213-4) does not go into the content of the song, but simply states that Apollo turns from war songs 'to a higher vein', thereby ignoring Sts.' interest in natural science. Similarly, at the katabasis of Amphiaraus (*Th.* VIII 808 ff.) St. offers 6 different explanations of the opening of the earth. This method is found in Lucr. and other didactic poets, rhetors, historians and poets who want to give a scientific air to their poetry. Four of these 6 explanations are in terms of natural phenomena, see also II 7, 27.

Isidorus does justice to Sts.' interest in science by beginning his section on lightning by quoting *Th.* X 924 *fulguraque attritis quotiens micuere procellis*: Isid. *Nat. rer.* X 30, 1[21].

For the use of different explanations in poetry and for the unity of science and literature in antiquity in general, see Schrijvers 1978 (with literature).

tactus: 'Touch', but also 'stroking' (Cancik 1965, 56), see *Ach.* I 343 *admoto...comere tactu.* St. plays on the erotic sense of *tactus* and *tangere*, see Ov. *Am.* III 7, 39-41 *At qualem vidi tetigique puellam...Illius ad tactum Pylius iuvenescere possit*, also *Am.* I 5, 19, Westendorp Boerma on Verg. *Cat.* 1, 4, Vorberg *s.v.*, e.g. Catul. 21, 8, *Priap.* 28, 5, Hor. *Epod.* 9, 22, Mart. I 73, 1.

---

[21] I owe this reference to Mrs. A. M. Jamin-van der Valk.

57-9. Tandem eluctata sub auras libratur fundo rursusque enode cacumen ingeniosa levat: 'At last, it forces its way up into the air and balances away from the bottom and it cunningly lifts its knotless head'.

I think that Vollmer's intricate explanation is completely wrong: '*trotz des Luftzuges hat der zuerst immer weggebogene Ast endlich, gewissermassen unter dem Spiritus hindurch* (*so nahe ist er dem Wasser*) *stärker werdend sich die wagerechte Stellung errungen und erhebt nun vom Grunde* (*que* zu *fundo*) *wieder, ohne eine Verzweigung* (*enode*) *seine Spitze*'.

To begin with a simple point: *sub auras* is not '*gewissermassen unter dem Spiritus hindurch*', but a synonym for the more usual *ad auras* or *in auras*, into the air, see *Th.* VI 857, Ov. *Met.* III 296, V 641 (Arethusa coming up in Sicily): (*Ortygia*) *me superas eduxit prima sub auras* (see Bömer there for the expression), XII 525. *Tandem* means 'after trying to touch the pool for a long time' and has nothing to do with the *spiritus.* There is no reason at all why *-que* should belong to *fundo*, nor has St. any other instance of postponed *-que*, see II 6, 16n.

Mozl. and Fr. accept this 'postponed *que*' but they take *fundo* as the base of the tree: 'and poised upon its base', '*et éléver la tige lisse de son faîte*'. *Fundus* 'stem' does not seem to occur in Latin. *TLL* (VI^1 1575, 24 ff.) gives it '*de fructibus, de radicibus herbarum*', where in all examples it seems to mean 'the base of a tree': Pallad. IV 9, 16 (...*cervice*...*ventre*...*fundo* of a plant), Diosc. I 229, IV 100 and 5 other examples from the *Vulgate* and the Fathers, most of them in a transferred use. Though the meaning 'base' is thus seen to be possible, these examples (originating in Greek use) can be no great recommendation, nor is 'balances upon its base' a very meaningful expression.

The most simple interpretation of *fundo* is 'the bottom of the pool' as in I 5, 52 *in summum fundo patet omnis ab imo* and most other places in St., e.g. *Th.* IX 271 and 468, see *OLD* 1b, *TLL* VI^1 1574, 79-1575, 24. 'The tree 'balances' away from the bottom' is the same as *cacumen levat* and explained by *veluti* ff.: it seems to get away from the bottom, because it mirrors itself in the water to which it is so near (as Vollm. says). For *librare*, see Plin. *Nat.* XVI 5 (deracinated oaks) *vastas complexu radicum insulas auferunt, atque ita libratae stantes navigant*; for the abl., see *Th.* X 118 *se*...*librabat ab aethere* (Iris), Plin. *Nat.* XI 24 *librans ex alto sese.* The tree 'balances', because it does not rise straight from its base, but curves away from it.

That is why it is called *ingeniosa*, 'clever' (not 'as its nature commands it to do': Traglia-Ar.). The word is not used elsewhere for living nature, except for 3 occurrences of *ingeniosa ad* + dat. in Ov. Everywhere else it is either said of persons, or of incorporeal things (*res, virtus*), see *TLL* VII 1521, 39-42. In St. it occurs only here.

eluctata: in St. only at *Ach.* I 525 (where it is transitive). Here it means 'to force a way out or up, struggle clear' (*OLD* 2), see e.g. Sen. *Nat.* IV a 2, 5 *de terra in superiora eluctatur* (a comet).

enodis: also occurs only here in St. See e.g. Verg. *G.* II 78 *enodes trunci*, Ov. *Met.* X 94 *enodis abies.*

cacumen must apparently by explained as 'stem' here, in view of *enodis.* Elsewhere it is always the top of trees (or shoots), see *TLL* III 10, 64 ff. (12, 19: 'syn. *fastigium, summitas, vertex*'), André 1956 *s.v.*

It may be contended that the tree lifts its head, and therefore, of course its trunk, but Sts.' choice of the word *cacumen* is unparalleled and shows his usual straining of the language. For expressions which could inspire him, see Quint. *Inst.* VIII 3, 10 *fugientia in altum cacumina olivae*, Sil. VI 221 *procera cacumina saltus.*

The word is characteristic for high poetry: Ovid has it 28 × in *Met.* and *Fast.*, twice in the rest of his poetry (Bömer at *Met.* I 30). St. has it 5 times in the Thebaid, 4 times in the (much shorter) *Silvae.* See 1-5n. (*ceu*).

veluti descendat in imos stirpe lacus alia: 'As though it descends with another root to the bottom of the pool'. *Stirps* is 'root', see *Th.* IV 300 *myrtos a stirpe revocant*, X 674-5 *cupressus combibit...et stirpe et vertice flammas.*

For *imos* (:M², *unos*: M), see 30-4n.

60-1. Phoebeia Naias: The Naiad of Diana. *Phoebeius* referring not to Apollo, but to Diana is not found elsewhere in Latin. *OLD* mentions Man. IV 856 *exceduntque suo Phoebeia tempora casu*, but both van Wageningen and Housman explain that as *solarem annum.* St. may have been inspired by the use of *Phoebeius* in a more loose sense: Ov. *Met.* IX 663 *Phoebeia Byblis*, the granddaughter of Apollo, *Phoebeus anguis*, the snake of Aesculapius (*Met.* XV 742), *Phoebea ad limina*, the temple of Aesculapius at *Silv.* III 4, 80, and esp. Ov. *Pont.* II 2, 80 *tempora Phoebea virgine nexa* = the bay = Daphne loved by Apollo. St. could use the word in this sense here because he has already made it clear that the nymph belongs with Diana.

exclusos invitat gurgite ramos: *Exclusos invitat* is pointedly juxtaposed: for the allusion to love poetry and the *exclusus amator* (e.g. Prop. I 5, 20 with Rothstein's note, I 16, 8, Ov. *Am.* I 6, 31, Tib. II 3, 73), see 46-8n.

gurgite is syntactically ambiguous: it can be taken with *invitat*, see *Ach.* I 79 *invitat curru* with Brinkgreve there and on I 43, who explains the abl. '*per analogiam verborum ponendi vel locandi*'. But it can also be explained as *exclusos gurgite.* As Cancik says (1965, 56), '*das Wasser lädt ein und wehrt ab*', see 53-61n.

62-77. Epilogue: the poem shows its function as a present for Melior's birthday (62-3). The middle part is taken up with praise of him (64-71), smoothly leading over to wishes for a long life (72-7). The mention there of Melior's loved ones who have passed away underlines his *pietas* (76-7n.).

The beginning and the end of the epilogue refer to a very long life in memory, 72 ff. to a long life for Melior. St. does not only make a traditional claim to immortality for his poetry (at 62-3), but he implies that Melior will profit from that too, or even that, as Melior immortalized Blaesus, Melior and St. will immortalize each other, *cf.* 43-52n., 75-7n.

Melior, as the most important person of *Silvae* II, had a claim to praise by St., which in II 1 could only stand in the context of his *pietas* for his dead favourite. Here he is praised for his general way of life: he follows the middle track in everything (67). Rather than specifically Epicure's ideal of the wise man (thus Vollm. at 63), this seems a general ideal, *cf.* at II 2, 153 *temperies.* Unlike Pollius and others Melior is nowhere called an Epicurean, thought St. had ample space for it.

62-3. Haec tibi parva quidem genitali luce paramus dona: 'This is the present I give you on your birthday, small indeed...'. St. now starts to address Atedius, after having spoken of him in the third person (1, 15). Similarly, the name of the addressee is often mentioned at the end of the poem (II 1, 227-30n.). But here the function of the poem changes with the address: from a 'mere' *aition* it becomes a present. Similarly St. sometimes characterizes his *consolationes* as a present, see II 1 *Intr.* under **I.**

For this function see Call. *Aitia* I 24 ff. with Pfeiffer, and *Intr.* here for the poem as a birthday present.

There is a similar twist in the poem in IV 4, where St. first speaks to his letter, which is (or becomes) the poem, then the letter speaks to Marcellus, until St. himself concludes in 78 *Haec ego...ad te, Marcelle, sonabam.* Most of Sts.' poems are, of course, presents, to his friends, or the emperor, but they are not often characterized as such. *Cf.* also IV 9, 7-9 (but this refers to the habit of giving away books at the Saturnalia). See also at II 1, 189 and II 4, 11.

genitali: 'connected with a birth(day)', *cf.* V 5, 70 *genitali carmine fovi*, Ov. *Tr.* III 13, 17 *liba...dem proprie genitale notantia tempus*, Tac. *Ann.* XVI 14 *genitalis dies*, II 7, 82n., 132n.

paramus: 'to give', *cf.* IV 4, 71-2 *parvoque exempla parabis/magna Getae.*

dona: the poetic plural is frequent since Lucr. I 52 (about his poem), e.g. Verg. *Ecl.* 6, 80, *G.* IV 1, *A.* II 36. St. has *donum* once (III 4, 37) against *dona* 25 times.

For *tibi*, see II 1, 52-4n., 102-5n.

parva quidem...sed ingenti forsan victura sub aevo: The fact that the poem is a birthday present is important to the thought *parva quidem...sed ingenti.* It touches upon the age-old *topos* that a literary work may live forever, since Homer *Il.* VI 357-8, also *Od.* VIII 579-8, Hes. *Op.* 1, Sapph. *fr.* 147 (LP), Theog. 237-54, Pind. *Pyth.* 3, 112-5 and 6, 5-14, *Nem.* 5, 1 ff., Theocr. 16, 34-47, Enn. *epitaph.*, Verg. *G.* III 8-9, Hor. *Carm.* II 20, III 30, IV 2, 19 ff., IV 8, 13 ff., *Ep.* II 1, 248 ff., Prop. III 2, Verg. *A.* IX 446-9, Ov. *Am.* I 10, 61 ff., I 15, III 15, 19-20, *Ars* III 339-40, *Met.* XV 871-9, *Tr.* III 3, 77-80, Mart. VII 84, 5 ff., VIII 3, 5 ff., IX 76, 9 ff., X 2, 9 ff., X 26, 5 ff., *Anth.Lat.* 972, 9 ff., see II 7, 71-2. The theme is first expressed in Latin by Naevius and Ennius, see Suerbaum 41 and 111 and for its persistence 165-235, for its history *Appendix* 44, Nisbet-H. Hor. *Carm.* II pp. 335-7. In II 7 St. proves the truth of poetical immortality for Lucan and in V 3, 134-45, 195-209 for his father.

parva must also be seen in this tradition: poetry is for Catul., Hor., Prop. both a trifle and gives everlasting fame (*cf.* Catul. 1, 1 and 1, 10), see 6-7n. and Brouwers 149-51.

St. himself speaks more confidentially of the immortality of his poetry in the course of time: *Th.* XII 810 ff. are, at least superficially, somewhat diffident, like *Silv.* I *Praef.* 5 ff. Contrast IV 7, 26-8 *Thebais.../ temptat audaci fide Mantuanae/gaudia famae* and *Ach.* I 12-3 *neque inter prisca parentum/nomina cumque suo numerant Amphione Thebae,* see Vollmer *Einleitung* 11 *Anm.* 4, Traglia-Ar. 45-6.

With regard to his *Silvae,* St. speaks quasi-modestly of them as trifles, though he is more aggressive in IV *Praef.*, see II *Praef.* 8-13n., *Intr.* under I here. In III 3, 37 he says *Nos non arsura feremus/munera venturosque tuus durabit in annos me monstrante dolor, cf.* V 1, 11-3 *Nos tibi...longa nec obscurum finem latura perenni temptamus dare iusta lyra.* In every case St. honours the addressee of the poem with his claim.

According to Szelest (1966, 197), this is one of the few places where St. shows himself to his readers, see I 5, 8-9 and 10-4, II 2, 1-13, III 1, 163-4, IV 6, 1-4, *cf.* II 2, 107-54n. But this seems a bit exaggerated: his *consolationes* all contain references to St. himself, III 5 is all about himself *etc.*

forsan, like *parva,* tones down Sts.' pretensions. For the word itself, see II 6, 101n.

ingenti...aevo: see III 1, 111 *immenso...aevo* and for the fusion of words of extent and quantity: II 1, 219-20n. (*immensis umbris*). *Ingens* in expressions denoting time is not in *OLD. TLL* gives our vs., (Ov.) *Hal.* 99 *parva echenais, at est, mirum, mora puppibus ingens,* where *ingens* cannot be claimed to refer to time, and Mart. XII 18, 13 *ingenti fruor improboque somno/quem non tertia saepe rumpit hora.*

For *victura*, see *Th.* XII 816 (*Thebai*), *vive, precor*, Ov. *Am.* I 15, 9 *vivet Maionides*, 11 *vivet et Ascraeus*, 42 *vivam* = *Met.* XV 879. St. seems the first to use *vivere* in such a context for the poetry itself. As Valpy remarks (ed. 1824) '*Hoc de suis operibus ac carminibus debuit sperare Papinius. Vixerunt et vivent*'.

64-71.: Melior is praised in a long period of loose structure and varied syntax: *cuius...cui...*vocative...nominative.

This is about the only poem of the *Silv.* where the praise of the addressee is not dispersed throughout the poem but concentrated at the end, see Szelest 1966, 192, also Lohrisch 70-1.

St. manages to get in many positive terms: *placido, blandus, hilaris, virtus, honesta, dulcia, incorrupte, ordine, auri contemptor.*

64-5. placido: *Cf.* II 1, 166-8n.

sedem: *Cf.* Plin. *Nat.* XI 157 *pudoris haec sedes, OLD* 7c.

blandus honos hilarisque tamen cum pondere virtus: 'ingratiating charm and gay virtue, yet not without seriousness'.

For *blandus honos*, see I 3, 11-2 (Venus has sprinkled Vopiscus' house with perfume) *blandum reliquit honorem/sedibus. Blandus* denotes esp. friendliness and tenderness in St., *cf.* esp. III 3, 151-2 *hunc...tenebas blandus et imperio nunquam pater* and II 1, 45-6n. *Honos* is not so much 'beauty' here (thus in II 6, 39 (n.)), but indicates an inner quality, *cf.* e.g. IV 2, 43-4 *ore nitebat dissimulatus honos.*

Melior, like Pollius Felix, has *virtus* (II 2, 71, *cf.* IV 8, 58); and so has Vopiscus (I 3, 91). Pollius' *virtus* is *quieta, pulchra*, Manlius' is *serena* and Melior's is *hilaris*. For Melior's *hilaritas*, see II 1, 168, and for the word itself, like *blandus* one of Sts.' favourites, see II 1, 56-7n. *Hilaris* is used by St. for only one other friend, young Vettius Bolanus (V 2, 73, his brother 126). Likewise *blandus* is said of Polla (III 1, 90), Etruscus (III 3, 152) and St. himself (V 5, 84). In spite of Sts.' preference for some words and the recurrence of topics, close verbal echoes are rare in the *Silvae*, and he treats his friends individually in his praise, *cf.* II 1, 2n., II 2 *Intr.* under **I.**, II 6 *Intr.* under **I.**

For *hilaris* as praise in St., *cf.* V 1, 64-5 *nec frons triste rigens...sed simplex hilarisque fides*, V 2, 73-4 *hilaris probitas et frons tranquilla nitorque luxuriae confine tenens.* Virtue, wisdom and joy are often connected by Seneca: *Dial.* III 6, 2 *gaudere laetarique proprium et naturale virtutis est*, *cf. Dial.* II 19, 3. Also in the letters: *Ep.* 27, 3-4 *sola virtus praestat gaudium perpetuum*; 30, 3; 59, 16; 72, 4 and 8-9. Esp. in *Ep.* 59, 16 many resemblances to these lines in St. are found: *sapiens ille plenus est gaudio, hilaris et placidus, inconcussus...si nulla spes animum tuum futuri expectatione sollicitat...ad hoc (gaudium) cupis pervenire, sed erras, qui inter divitias illuc venturum esse speras,*

inter honores... Nevertheless, to take away all suspicion of superficiality on Melior's part, St. adds *tamen cum pondere*: Melior is not superficial. For *pondus*, see I 3, 90 *meditantur pondera mores*, V 3, 246 *expositos servato pondere mores, OLD* 7 ('gravity...dignity, solemnity').

tamen: 'though it is *hilaris*, yet...', see *Th.* I 202 *placido quatiens tamen omnia vultu* ('though his face was tranquil'), II 392 *iustis miscens tamen aspera coepit* ('though his words were just') with Mulder's note, Housman on Luc. I 333 *quem tamen inveniet longa potentia finem*, Bömer on Ov. *Met.* II 337.

66-7. nec pigra quies nec iniqua potentia nec spes improba, sed medius...limes: Two extremes are mentioned: doing nothing on the one hand, being a tyrant, or wishing to be one, on the other; and, it is explicitly said, Melior steers clear of both perils, taking the golden middle path. This is said again in *secrete palam* and again in *idem...idem...* For the golden mean, see II 2, 150-3n. and Motto *s.v.* St. nowhere says that Melior had specific philosophical leanings. But general ethical ideals did not differ very much from professed Stoic or Epicurean ones, see II 2, 26-9n., 26n., 150-3n.

pigra quies is the opposite of *nava quies* V 1, 76 (where Vollm. wrongly calls *quies* here '*im guten Sinne*'). The word *piger* adds the negative impact, for *quies* alone (V 1, 117) or *fecunda quies* (I 3, 91) are both positive, see at II 2, 7, *Ach.* I 438 *pigram gemit una quietem, Silv.* I 6, 91 *pigra Quies*, I 4, 57 *insidiosa quies et pigra oblivio vitae* (ληθαργία *cf.* II 2, 36-42n.), Mart. XII 62, 2, Apul. *Met.* XI 1, Willis 312.

iniqua potentia: *potentia* is generally already in itself a negative concept, unofficial power, distinct from official power, *potestas* (*OLD* 1), though this connotation is not always present, see e.g. *Ach.* I 225 *tantus honos formae nandique potentia.* Here *iniqua* makes it unambiguous. *Potentia* does not occur elsewhere in the *Silvae.*

nec spes/improba: *nec spes* is one of the rare cases in the *Silv.* where St. ends a line with two monosyllables: I 2, 35, II 1, 123, IV 2, 17, IV 6, 90. In the Thebaid this occurs in 0.77% of the lines, see O. Mueller 1861, 19-20, Cancik *Forschungsbericht* 3.2.2, II 6, 15-7n.

spes improba is ambition to *iniqua potentia*, see II 1, 2n., II 2, 123-5, *Th.* VI 691 *spes immodicas.*

medius per honesta et dulcia limes: A strange phrase. At first sight one is tempted to explain this as 'a mid-path between duty and pleasure'. This is what all translations do, except for Clouard (Vollm. is silent): Mozl., Fr., Argenio, Sb., Traglia-Ar.

This cannot be right, for it would imply that *honesta* and *dulcia* are two extremes which must be avoided, *fines malorum.* And, besides, *per* =

'between' is impossible. Whenever it is explained as 'between, without touching', that is, in expressions like *per tela, per hostis* (Verg. *A.* II 527, 358, *cf.* 664, XI 497, XII 682, Hor. *Carm.* IV 4, 59), it means not merely 'between', but 'between and through them'.

dulcis is always positive in St. and never implies pleasure as something to be avoided.

honestus in particular is always positive, both in St. (who has it 4 times, but *cf.* also *honos*) and elsewhere. It is either something very good or even the *summum bonum.* (Cic. *Fin.* III 12 and elsewhere, *TLL* VI[3] 2910, 69 ff. and 2911, 45 ff.). It is sometimes contrasted with *iucundum* (Cic. *Fin.* III 1, *TLL* 2911, 72 ff.), but always as a positive contrast, not as another extreme which must be avoided. Nor is *honestum* found in the sense of 'duty', or *honesta* as *honores*, 'political offices'.

So St. must mean that Melior's way must lead through *honesta*, morally good things, and *dulcia*, pleasurable things. This can be effected by avoiding both *pigra quies*, for which *dulcia* is substituted, and *iniqua potentia*, contrasted with *honesta.* See V 3, 248-9 *quantus amor recti* (= *honesta*) *rursusque ubi dulce remitti* (*dulcia*) *gratia quae dictis*, Clouard's *qui te conduis entre l'honnête et l'agréable* comes nearest to what St. means.

68-9. incorrupte fidem: (*Incorruptae*: M, the *a* was erased by M[2]): 'whose loyalty is unstained'. For *fides*, see e.g. II 6, 10 and 55, esp. V 1, 76-7 *vidit* (sc. *Fortuna*) *quippe pii iuvenis navamque quietem/intactamque fidem.* The retained accusative with *incorruptus* is not found elsewhere, but see *integer* with acc. in *Th.* IV 94 *integer artus*, VIII 846-7.

St. probably imitates Hor. *Carm.* I 24, 7 *incorrupta Fides.*

nullos...experte tumultus: 'Who has not experienced disturbances', see II 2, 127, 140-2, also II 2, 26n.

et secrete palam quod digeris ordine vitam: Many conjectures have been made and explanations given. Most edd., whether they keep the text or not, punctuate after *secrete* with a comma, except for Saenger who obelizes and Phill. who writes *sectate* for *secrete.* Clouard, Fr. and Traglia keep the text. I think they are right and their interpretation 'you live alone, but openly in the midst of all' is attractive. *Secrete* alludes to λάθε βιώσας, *cf.* II 2, 123-4. *Palam* is an *oxymoron* with it: Melior did not live secluded like Pollius Felix, but in the middle of Rome.

This seems better than to take *palam* together with *ordine* to explain *secrete* (= λαθών) as Vollm. (reading *quom* for *quod* after Adrian 32) and Mozl. do: '...ordered for all to see', see III 5, 10 *sine fraude palam.*

quod can remain: 'you have not experienced *tumultus*, you live apart in the middle of others, because you organize your life with method' (thus Fr. after Karsten 352, who, however, takes *palam* with *digeris*).

qui: Domitius, accepted by Clouard, the best choice after *quod*, is unnecessary. *Quo*, ascribed to σ by Vollm. and Fr., to Baehr. by Mar. ('an *quo*?': Baehr. *app.*), claimed for himself by Postg. and printed by Phill., is unclear. For *vitam digerere*, see Verg. *A.* II 182 *ita digerit omina Calchas* and Austin there: '*Digerit* implies "analysing", "arranging" and so "expounding" ', *OLD* 4b.

For *ordine*, see Plin. *Ep.* III 1, 3 *etiam parva haec...ordine quodam et velut orbe circumagit*: old Spurinna, whose ordered life is described enthusiastically by Pliny, *cf.* 9 *cena non minus nitida quam frugi...Corinthia, quibus delectatur nec afficitur*: a middle course, see also 70-1 here.

70-1. idem auri facilis contemptor et optimus idem...opibus...immittere lucem: 'You are both ready to despise gold and very good in letting the light shine over it'. A similar compliment is paid in II 2, 150-3 *non...strangulat arca divitias...expositi census* (though there Pollius' enjoyment of his money is stressed and here Melior's openness). See note there and Sen. *Ep.* 5, 3-6 for the theme.

contemptor occurs only here in the *Silv.*, 5 times in the Thebaid, *cf.* Liv. XXXIX 40, 11 *contemptor gratiae, divitiarum.*

optimus followed by the inf. does not occur in Luc., VFl., Juv., but *bonus* (VFl.) and *melior* (VFl., Luc.) do, see Clement, Williams on *Th.* X 234, e.g. VFl. I 424 *melior contundere*, Luc. VIII 381 *melior cessisse.* For adjectives followed by the inf. in general, see II 1, 166-8n.

For the pun in (Melior) *optimus* see II 2, 23n.

opibus immittere lucem: see Ov. *Met.* V 358 *immissus dies*, Vitr. VI 6, 6 *locum quo oporteat immittere* (*lucem*).

optimus...comere divitias: This is in M and printed by all editors, wrongly, I think. This is shown by the translations: 'setting in array' (Mozl.), '*tirer honneur*' (Clouard), '*disposer de*' (Fr.), '*ammuchiare*' (Argenio), '*amministratore*' (Traglia-Ar.). None of these very diverging meanings can be paralleled.

What *comere* means is something like *ornare*, and it is virtually only used for the body, clothes or weapons (e.g. *Th.* XI 405), see *TLL* III 1991, 41-1992, 48. This is expressed by Sbordone's '*dare lustro*', but what he means is obscure. The same goes for Vollmer's '*comere divitias* geschieht durch das *opibus immittere lucem*'.

That these two phrases explain each other, however, seems probable. And all difficulties disappear if we accept the 15th-century conjecture (see van Dam 394) *promere*, 'to show your riches'. It is the same thing as *expositi census* in II 2, 152, *cf.* Sid. *Carm.* 22, 148-9 *nam locuples fortuna domus non passa latere/divitias prodit* and Mart. Cap. quoted by Hemsterhuis (see van Dam *loc. cit.*) *promtae ubertatis ornatibus opulentae.* For

promere, see also IV 8, 39 *cadum sordentem promere fumo*, Cic. *Ver.* 3, 195 *cum senatus pecuniam prompsisset.* This reading is accepted by Nisbet 1978, 8 (who still ascribes it to Madvig, see van Dam *loc. cit.*).

72-4. hac...animi morumque iuventa: St. ends with good wishes for long youth, see II 2, 107 ff.(n.). In I 3, 110 these wishes also follow upon the praise of riches. The wish for long life occurs also in II 2, 146-7 (n.).

For *animi iuventa*, see II 2, 10 *iuvenilis gratia*, I 2, 276 *virides...flore iuventae...vultus.* The expression implies that Melior is not young anymore, see also II 1 *Intr.*, II 2 *Intr.*; for the *topos* of youthful age and mature character or *vice versa*, see II 1, 38-40n.

morum iuventa is less normal, see *TLL* VIII^2 741, 76 ff., where only instances of concrete things are given for this metaphorical sense.

longum: For *diu* occurs often in St. (e.g. I 3, 13, I 4, 15) and many authors since Pl. *Epid.* 376, see *TLL* VIII^2 1643, 34 ff.

florens: Though trite in itself, reminds of the tree, and so does *iuventa*, see 50 *senecta.*

Iliacos...senes: see II 2, 106-7n.

vincere persta quos pater Elysio, genetrix quos detulit annos: Apparently Melior's parents have died at an advanced age (which also implies that he himself is not young any more) and St. wishes that he may live longer than either of them. In strict logic this phrase should either mean that St. wishes Melior to surpass their combined ages, or that they died at the same age, otherwise he would not have had to mention them both, but this seems to take St. too literal, see also II 1, 30-2n., II 6, 24-5n.

A cognate wish in *epicedia* is that the survivor may live the years which were still 'in stock' for the deceased one (V 1, 177-8, Prop. IV 11, 95, *Epic. Drusi* 413, *CE* 995, 25 f., 1551, 4, *cf.* Sen. *Dial.* X 8, 4, Tert. *Apol.* 35, Ambros. *Obitu Valent.* 43 and Versnel 1982, 568: E.-F. 143 § 42 B, f and 151 § 63). But this is not meant here, see *detulit.*

The mention of the age of Melior's parents is a kind of anti-climax after the Trojan old men. But it ends the poem with a personal touch, like I 5, 65 *tua iam melius discat fortuna renasci.* Moreover, it shows Melior's *pietas*, which is more explicitly stated in 76-7.

persta: 'to continue resolutely in an attitude' (*OLD* 3), *cf.* V 3, 176-7 *proceres...futuros...in...patrum vestigia ducere perstas.*

The most helpful punctuation seems to be a comma after *senes* and no comma after *persta* (Clouard, Phill.). Most editors do the reverse.

Elysio comes out of Q. M has *helisia.* Baehrens proposed *Elysius* and Phill.[1] *Elysiae* (*reginae*), abusing Mart. X 24, 10. Vollm. suggested *Elysium*, which is printed by Postg., Kl., Saeng. and Mozl. (see II 7, 111-2n.).

But *Elysio* is right, see *Th.* VII 784-5 *laurus, quas Erebo deferre nefas* (quoted by Fr.). Elsewhere St. employs a preposition for indicating going under the earth (III 3, 206 *ad umbras*, V 1, 197 *in*, V 3, 261 *sub*). Moreover, the dative is very usual since Verg. *A.* II 398 *demittimus Orco* (the first instance of a change of the formula *leto dare* into an indication of the Underworld itself), *cf.* II 4, 33, see Löfstedt 1942², 180-1 with many instances and literature, and 1-5n.

75-7. hoc illi...exoravere...hoc...gloria Blaesi: 'This they have obtained, this the renown of Blaesus has obtained'. *Exorare*, 'to obtain by entreaty' (*OLD* 2), *cf.* II 7, 122, V 2, 94-5 *quin saevas utinam exorare liceret Eumenidas*, V 3, 294-5 *cur nihil exoret, genitor, chelys aut tua Manis aut mea.* The double acc. with it occurs also e.g. at Pl. *Poen.* 380, Sen. *Dial.* VII 14, 1 see *OLD* 2b.

duras...sorores: The Parcae, see II 1, 120, on *soror* II 1, 185; and for *dura* (a commonplace): e.g. II 6, 81, V 1, 156 and 178.

quae te sub teste situm fugitura tacentem ardua magnanimi revirescet gloria Blaesi: For Melior's *pietas* regarding Blaesus, see II 1, *Intr.*, II 1, 191-3n. The reference here is very apt: Melior has founded a fund to enable the *collegium scribarum* to celebrate Blaesus' birthday (Fr. 75 n. 2, *RE* VII 1144, Suerbaum 4 n. 9). Thus the glory of Blaesus will flourish. St. similarly has a gift for Melior's birthday, this poem, which will help Melior *fugere situm Statio sub teste.* The same poem immortalizes a tree, as Melior immortalized Blaesus. This tree is old already, as Melior will also become, see 43-52n., 62-77n.

The word *revirescet* is also well chosen: it is used for trees, e.g. in Col. II 1, Ov. *Met.* II 408, Plin. *Nat.* XXI 23, 1, and it is also used for persons as 'to become young and vigorous again', 'to revive in spirit' (*OLD* 1b, 1c), e.g. V. Max. IV 8, 4, Sil. VIII 228 *dux, promissae revirescens pignore laudis*, XV 134. The metaphorical use seems the oldest one, see Bömer on Ov. *loc. cit.*

te sub teste: V 3, 226-7 *dona coronae te sub teste tuli, Ach.* II 153 *nec duri tanto sub teste labores.* So it means 'because of your (active) presence'.

situm fugitura tacentem: see *Th.* III 99-100 *tu...nec unquam...passure situm*, III 3, 208-10 *senior...nunquam...triste chaos maestique situs patiere sepulchri* (where it means both 'decay' and 'oblivion', see *OLD* 2 and II 1, 67-8n.).

tacentem: because Blaesus has escaped oblivion, when he would not have been spoken about. For a possible pun, see II 2, 23-4n.

fugitura: see II 1, 52n.

ardua magnanimi...gloria: for *ardua* and *magnanimi*, see II 1, 191. Note that St. has varied *illi*, your parents, by the abstract *gloria*, as the subject of *exoravere.*

Revirescet: according to Mar. (*app.*), M has *reviresset*, Q *revirescit* and *AFHIKS* have *revirescet*. Earlier editors read *revirescit* (Baehr., Vollm., Kl., Postg., Clouard, also Fr. and Sb.), mainly because the evidence for *revirescet* was not fully recognized (Fr. *app.* says '-scet *nonnulli edd.*').

Phill., Saeng., Mozl., Mar. and Traglia read *revirescet*. Fr. contends *nihil loci est futuro*, comparing Mart. VIII 38, 10 *nomen non sinis interire Blaesi*. But there *sinis* is stronger than *sines*, while here the future seems to give more certainty. It is, moreover, probable after *fugitura*.

Blaesi: for Sts.' habit of putting a name at the end of his poems, see II 1, 166-8n., II 1, 227-9n., on II 5, 34 *leonem*.

II. 4. PSITTACUS ATEDII MELIORIS

Animals and poems on dead animals:

G. Herrlinger, *Totenklage um Tiere in der antiken Dichtung.* Stuttgart 1930.

G. Jennison, *Animals for Show and Pleasure in Ancient Rome.* Manchester 1937.

A. Lytton Sells, *Animal Poetry in French and English Literature and the Greek Tradition.* Indiana Univ. Press 1955.

A. Sauvage, *Etude des thèmes animaliers dans la poésie Latine. Le cheval. Les oiseaux.* Bruxelles 1975.

J. M. C. Toynbee, *Animals in Roman Life and Art.* London 1973.

Statius and Ovid:

R. E. Colton, *"Parrot Poems" in Ovid and Statius.* CB 43 (1967), 71-8.

E. Thomas, *A Comparative Analysis of Ovid Amores II 6 and III 9.* Latomus 24 (1965), 599-609.

Humour and Parody:

J. P. Cèbe, *La caricature et la parodie dans le monde romain antique des origines jusqu'à Juvénal.* Paris 1966.

F. J. Lelièvre, *The Basis of Ancient Parody.* G & R 1 (1954), 66-81.

E. de Saint Denis, *Essai sur le rire et le sourire des Latins.* Paris 1965.

Funerary poetry:

See II 1 *Intr.*

I. In no other poem is St. so obviously influenced by Ovid: this lament for the death of Atedius Melior's parrot can be considered, with some qualifications, an imitation of Ov. *Amores* II 6 on the dead parrot of Corinna. These are the only ancient poems on dead parrots, but they stand within the tradition of the poem for a dead animal. Funerary poetry for animals can easily develop parodistic traits, generally by borrowing expressions from funerary poems for human beings. In the following some of these aspects of the literary tradition will be treated.

The first poems on dead animals are Greek Hellenistic epigrams of the third century B.C.[1]. Their subjects are mainly domestic animals and pets: dogs, horses, cicadas and birds. These epigrams exemplify the general interest both in daily life and smaller matters and in the creation of *genre*-scenes and the playing with form (Herrlinger 1 ff.). The real epitaph on a dead animal, as well as the purely literary epigram, probably arose within the same period and with the same poets: Anyte of Tegea, Nicias of Miletus and others (*ibid.* 106 ff.). The epigraphic poems, however, are of small relevance to us, since, with some excep-

---

[1] But the poem on the dead hound Lykas (*GV* 1489 = Herrlinger n° 9) is generally dated earlier, see B. Lorenz, *Thessalische Grabgedichte vom 6. bis zum 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (Innsbruck 1976), 122-6 with n. 3, against Herrlinger 1 and 20 ff.

tions, they either date from the third cent. B.C. and are alike in tone to the literary production, or they are from the second cent. A.D. and show a clear influence from first-century Latin poetry.

Herrlinger makes a tripartition into '*das ernst-sentimentale Epikedium*', '*das parodistische*' and '*das pointierte*'. With the last two terms he tries to define the ways in which at about 100 B.C. the serious epigram was given new life: Meleager of Gadara tried to ridicule his predecessors with his poem on a courtesan's hare, which died of indigestion after eating too many spring-flowers and which now rests near the bed of its mistress (*AP* VII 207). Antipater of Sidon, on the other hand, tried to inject a new interest into these poems by striving after effect in diction and content (Herrlinger 64-5, 72-4, 92 ff., *AP* VII 209, 210, 216, IX 18, 222, 370, 418 = Herrlinger nos 28-35). Though the boundaries between the three kinds are blurred, this distinction has its uses. Herrlinger includes all Latin poems on dead animals, except for *Silv.* II 5 and *Culex* 413-4—which seems rather out of place in his collection—, either under the parodistic form: Catul. 3, Ov. *Am.* II 6, *Silv.* II 4, *Testamentum porcelli* = Petr. *Sat.* 269 *in fine* (Buecheler), or under the pointed kind: Mart. IV 32, XI 69, Aus. *Carm.* 33[2].

Two things must be made clear: by 'parody' or 'parodistic' I mean 'something sung—or composed—conformably to an original, but with a difference' (Lelièvre 66). A parody does not necessarily criticize its original[3]. This original can be (part of) a literary work, e.g. Verg. *Cat.* 10, 1-2 which parody Catul. 4, 1-2. It can be the whole output of an author: Aristophanes parodying the style of Euripides in *The Frogs*. A *genre* or a technical vocabulary can also be parodied: thus Horace parodies the hymn-style in *Carm.* III 21 and Ovid the didactic *genre* in his *Ars*[4]. How faithfully the words of one particular work are quoted in a parody depends on the intention. In the bird-poems of Catullus, Ovid and Statius the parody is of one *genre*, the *consolatio*. Secondly, by 'parodistic' I do not mean that the poem as a whole is a parody, but that some phrases and allusions parody an original, making it impossible to

---

[2] The non-literary Latin poems from antiquity are *CIL* V 4512 on a racehorse, VI 2, 10082 also on a horse, VI 4, 29896: the lap-dog Margarita, VI 5, 54: a bird, IX 5785: a cart-dog, X 659: the lap-dog Patricus, XII 1122: the horse Borysthenes (possibly written by the emperor Hadrian), XIII 488: the lap-dog Myia. A Greek epitaph found on the *via Egnatia* near Edessa (2nd/3rd cent. A.D.) is sometimes thought to be a (parodistic) epitaph on a pig, see REG 83 (1970) 407 (= Bull. Epigr. n° 363). Others, however, explain it as a (serious) epitaph on a slave called Χοῖρος, see SEG 25 (1971), n° 711 and 26 (1976-7), n° 727.

[3] There may even exist a deliberate difference in ancient literary theory between παρῳδεῖν, ἐπὶ τὸ γελοῖον παρῳδεῖν (Ath. XIV 638b) and σκωπτικῶς παρῳδεῖν (Eust. at *Od.* I 1), see Lelièvre 74 n. 2.

[4] See Norden 1912, 144 ff., Antony 102, Frécaut 126 ff., 226 ff.

see the poem as merely serious and sentimental, see Herrlinger 76. For the whole, see Herrlinger 72, Lelièvre 70-3, Cèbe 11-2, Antony 102 ff., 134 ff.

For the Latin development Catul. 3 is the decisive factor: it is influenced by the Hellenistic epigram in its subject and in the touches of humour and parody in its treatment of the subject, the importance given to the little bird (1-2), the elements from the *consolatio* (11-5), the malediction of fate together with the bird itself (16)[5]. On the other hand, its metre is different from that of the epigram, and, most importantly, it is essentially a love-poem[6]. After this poem, the influence of the epigram on Latin animal-poetry wanes considerably.

Ovid took up Catullus' central idea of writing a poem on the dead bird of his mistress, but he combined it with an overt parody of the *consolatio*: *Am.* II 6 can be divided into **1)** 'The parrot is dead'. Exhortation to the *piae volucres* to mourn: 1-16. **2)** Praise of the bird: *fides, forma*, peacefulness and frugality: 17-42. **3)** Illness, death on the seventh day, last words (*Corinna, vale*): 43-8. **4)** *Consolatio*: the parrot is in the *Elysium* of birds together with other *piae volucres*: 49-60. **5)** Its grave and epitaph: 61-2. It will have been noted that this is (the first Latin example of) a formal *consolatio*, see II 1 *Intr.*, E.-F. 39-42, and Thomas 1965. *Am.* II 6 is different from Catul. 3, which has no illness, death, or *consolatio.* Its parodistic intent is revealed in the human details transposed to the death of a bird: the mourning-rites which the birds must perform (*plangite pectora pinnis/et rigido teneras ungue notate genas;/horrida pro maestis lanietur pluma capillis* 3-5), the virtues, death, *Elysium, etc.*, see Herrlinger 83-6, Frécaut 343-4. This becomes especially clear if the poem is compared to *Am.* III 9 on the death of Tibullus. That the purpose of II 6 is humorous is stressed by emphasizing not only the bird's perfect imitation of the human voice (1, 23-4, 37, 47-8, 62), but also its loquacity, which left it no time to eat and after death attracts all the birds in *Elysium* (26, 29-30, 57-8), see Colton 76 and esp. Thomas 1965.

Which of these influences can be found in Statius? There is not much of the Greek epigram: earlier epigrams on dead birds exist (*AP* VII 191: Archias, 199: Tymnes, 202, 203: Anyte), which share some topics with *Silv.* II 4 (at 8, 11). St. also shows the awareness that his subject is one of the epigram (II *Praef.* 16-7 *epigrammatis loco*, see II 3 *Intr.*). But the metre and length of II 4 are different from epigrams. The similarities between St. and the Greek epigrams are best ascribed to their common subjects and to the intermediary poems of Catullus and Ovid.

---

[5] Reading *quod* in 16, after Goold 1969, 186 ff.

[6] *Cf.* Herrlinger 75-8, Bishop, CPh 61 (1966) 158 ff., Quinn 1970 *ad loc.*, G. Williams 469.

Silv. II 4, *consolatio* and parody are connected because this poem is a formal parody of the *consolatio* ('...*parodiert Statius, ...mit einem gewissen Ernste, die Form seiner eigenen Epikedien*': Vollm. 360, *cf.* Herrlinger 87-90, Fr. 76 n. 1). It can be divided as follows: **1)** *Lamentatio*: 1-15. **2)** Exhortation to mourn: 16-23. **3)** *Laudatio*: 24-33. **4)** *Descriptio funeris*: 33-6. **5)** *Consolatio*: 37-8 (but see at 33 ff.). That is to say that most elements from Sts.' *consolationes* feature here (not illness and death, see at 3, or arrival in the Underworld), but in disproportionate relative length and 'wrong' order, see II 1 *Intr.* I think this is Sts.' subtle way of parodying himself, as if he were to say, 'this is a poem to console my friend Melior, who is really sad about the death of his parrot. On the other hand, the loss of his small Glaucias (II 1) was a different thing', see also II 3 *Intr.* under **I.** It is significant that St. did not follow Ovid in the layout of his poem[7]. Apart from the poem's structure, its use of topics from the *consolatio* is parodistic, though not as burlesque as in Ovid; for that would have been tactless to Melior[8]. E.-F. (118) is wrong, I think, (with Newmyer 19 and 72) to reject II 4 as a *consolatio* on the mere strength of *epigrammatis loco* in II *Praef.* 16-7. For details, see at 8, 14-5, 24, 33 ff., see also II 3 *Intr.*

Considering single authors, Ovid's influence on Statius is paramount: the use of the *consolatio*, the idea of the other birds as mourners (Ov. 2 ff., St. 16 ff.), the periphrases for 'birds' (Ov. 27 ff., 51 ff., St. 17 ff., 25 ff.), the brilliant colours of the parrot (Ov. 17, 21-2, St. 25 ff.) and its power of speech. This influence reveals itself also in the many verbal parallels, see at 1-3, 17, 21, 24, 26, 36-7.

But there are differences in plan and structure of both poems, as well as in the emphasis on certain subjects: *Am.* II 6 is in a certain sense an extension of Catul. 3, whith rather heavy humorous overtones. Corinna is not central to the poem, but she plays an important part in it, esp. 19 *Quid iuvat, ut datus es, nostrae placuisse puellae?* See also Catul. 1-2/Ov. 3-4; 3/1; 6-10/17-9, 25-6; 11-2/48 ff.; 13-4/25, 39-40; Herrlinger 81-3. The erotic element of Ovid's poem is absent from *Silv.* II 4. Corinna and her parrot, moreover, may be entirely fictional, but Atedius Melior and his pet were well-known to St. This becomes clear in a detail like the description of the cage (11-5), and in the vivid description of the parrot picking bites from the table. Further, St. invites not *piae volucres* but talking birds to mourn. Correspondingly, he stresses more the contrast

---

[7] De Saint Denis 222: '*l'humour le plus subtil consiste...à ne pas...railler les imperfections d'autrui, mais à se moquer gentiment des siennes propres*'. However, I do not think that Vollm. means the same thing as I do with regard to formal parody.

[8] There seems to exist a tendency to reproach Ovid because his poem is more funny than Catul. 3, and to reproach St. because his poem is less funny than Ovid's (e.g. Herrlinger, Fordyce at Catul. 3).

between noise and silence, one of the central points of II 4, (7-9, 13-5, 29-33). An ingenious consequence of staging talking birds is the song which the birds must sing for their dead colleague. This song within the poem (24 ff., see 22-3n.) is the most important structural difference between *Am.* II 6 and *Silv.* II 4, *cf.* also the different order of the parts of the *consolatio*. Sts.' visual talent expresses itself in the description of the bright cage and in the long comparison of the parrot with other beautiful birds: 5 verses (24 ff.) against Ovid's 2, see *vidimus* 8. Like Ovid, St. plays on the human aspects of the parrot, *cf.* Frécaut 63. But he does not stress, as exclusively as Ovid does, the fact that it can talk, and thus is, in a sense human (3): to St. the bird is also a fellow-guest (4-5, 31) with a real house (*domus* 11, *tecti* 15), a friend and companion to Melior (30-3), which gets a real funeral (22 ff., 33 ff.). Last but not least, *Silv.* II 4 is much shorter than *Am.* II 6 (37/62). For further differences see 1n., 8-9n., 16-7n., 26-8n., 33-4n., 36-7n., and Colton.

Another Ovidian source for II 4 is the *Metamorphoses*: allusions to it are to be found in 9-10, 17-21, 26, 37, see Colton. St. makes use of the same technique as in II 3, of drawing on different Ovidian material at the same time. Of Catullus there is hardly a trace in the poem, see 1n. and 8-9n.

The theme of the dead parrot remained popular in literature, though mostly inspired by Ovid: Herrlinger, *Anhang* nos 78 (16th-17th cent.), 85 (17th cent.), 133 (19th cent.).

The parrot of Marguérite De Navarre, *l'amant vert*, which was killed by a dog in 1505, deserves special mention: Jean Lemaire de Belges devoted two long *épîtres en vers* to it (Lytton Sells 48-50). The parrot of Mme de Plessis-Bellière (17th cent.) received 25 sonnets with the same rhymes at its death[9].

In the edition by Cruceus (Paris 1618), Morellus states *nos hanc Sylvulam Statii iisdem numeris Graece in gratiam* φιλελλήνων *expressisse, quae Parafrasis nostra seorsum edita aera meret Sosiis.* Fédéric Morel was the Royal Printer from 1583 until 1617 and also a commentator and scholar. He translated into Greek several portions of different Latin poets, e.g. Horace's *Carmen Saeculare* and Ausonius' *Gryphus.* in 1601 he published a commentary on the *Silvae*, which Cruceus used for his *variorum*- edition[10].

[9] See Bray 185-6. One may also think of the maid's parrot in Flaubert's *Un cœur simple*, one of his *Trois Contes.*

[10] I could not find Morel's commentary in Holland. Cruceus: *Publii Papinii Statii opera cum observationibus ac cum commentariis tam veterum quam recentiorum interpretum Em. Cruceus recensuit & novo commentario Statii Sylvas illustravit cum indicibus locupletissimis.* On Morel, see W. P. Greswell, *A view of the Early Parisian Greek Press Including the Lives of the Stephani, Notices of other Contempory Greek Printers of Paris and Various Particulars of the Literary and Ecclesiastical History of Their Times* (Oxford 1833, repr. Amsterdam 1969), II 58 ff. and M. Mattaire, *Historia Typographorum aliquot Parisiensium vitas et libros complectens* (London 1717), I 115-42, II 73 ff.

I have, however, not found mention of a separate edition of *Silv.* II 4. It is the only Greek translation of the *Silvae* known to me.

II. In Sts.' time (and earlier) birds were often kept as pets, both singly and in aviaries. These became the fashion in the first century B.C., see Var. *R.* III 4, 2 ff., Cic. *Q.fr.* III 1, 1, Jennison 99, 101. The birds there were often kept for culinary reasons (*cf.* at 26 ff.). Apicius even mentions a recipe for parrots (V 6, 1 = Ed. J. André (Paris 1965), no 232), and Elegabalus served parrots' brains to his guests (Lampr. *Heliog.* 20, 6), see also Claud. *Eutr.* II 329-31 (guests) *qui...tradunt...palato/sidereas Iunonis aves et si qua loquendi/gnara coloratis viridis defertur ab Indis.*

The pets which we know of are: dove, pigeon, nightingale, raven, crow, magpie, *passer*, parrot, thrush, goldfinch, starling, see Petr. 46, 3-4, Plin. *Nat.* X 81, 110, 117-21, Mart. IX 54 and 55, XIV 73-7, Fro. 181(N), Jennison *Ch.* VI. Martial (VII 87) mocks the excessive love for animals of his contemporaries. As can be observed from the above list, talking birds were especially popular. Vollmer's remark, '*sprechende Vögel waren im Altertum wie noch heute bei naiven Menschen sehr beliebt*', reveals more about the commentator than about the feeling for birds in antiquity. Nor is 'naive' the first qualification that comes to mind for Nero's mother Agrippina, who possessed a speaking thrush (Plin. *Nat.* X 120).

Animals even had funerals sometimes: Alexander, followed by some Roman emperors, buried his horse (Herrlinger 11-2, Ael. *NA* XII 140); but more common horses had graves too, as may be concluded from the inscriptions quoted above and from Aus. *Carm.* 23, compare Hdt. VI 103, Plut. *Mor.* 339, D.S. XIII 82, Sol. 47. Dogs were also occasionally buried (Herrlinger *loc. cit.*), as were other animals: a dolphin (Gel. VI 8), a gander (*AP* VII 41), a murena (Ael. *NA* VIII 4), nightingale (Mart. VII 87, 8). Pliny tells an entertaining story about a tame raven which was killed by a shopkeeper. The indignant inhabitants of the quarter honoured it with a ceremonious funeral (*Nat.* X 121-3). Admittedly, these seem to be exceptions, and Martial is sarcastic. But it is wrong to conclude from the absence of inscriptional evidence for other animals than horses and dogs that birds were never buried. Nor is the artificiality of the poems by Ovid and Statius relevant to a decision on this question (*contra* Sauvage 275). For if that were an argument, we should be forced to conclude from Martial's poem on the dog Lydia (XI 69) or from Evelyn Waugh's *The Loved One* that dogs have never been buried.

1-15. Lamentatio: It consists of two parts, 1-10 and 11-5, both contrasting 'now' (1-3, 8-10, 14-5) and 'then' (4-7, less clearly 11-3). This is very frequent in the epigram, from Anyte onwards (Herrlinger 59, 81, οὐκέτι), and in the *consolatio*: E.-F. 137 § 27, Newmyer 64 ff., 87, e.g.

Ov. *Am.* II 6, 1-17 = present, 18-48 = past; compare Menander's instructions to arrange the funerary speeches according to the categories present, past, future: Soffel on Men. 435, 16-436, 10 and 435, 24-8. For a different exploitation of the contrast 'then/now', see II 2, 32-3n.

After the introductory question, the first part gives a particular instance of the parrot's behaviour (*hesternas...dapes* 4 ff.), and the second one describes a general aspect of it: the house. Both concentrate on the animal's noisy presence, without and within the cage: 7-10, 13-5.

Elements of the *laudatio* are present in the *lamentatio*, as is common (see II 1 *Intr.*): 1-2, 7-10, 11-5 for the cage, and thence the owner.

1-3. Parrot, who has killed you?: Ovid begins: *Psittacus, Eois imitatrix ales ab Indis,/occidit. Exequias ite frequenter aves.* St. changes nom. into the more pathetic voc., repeating it for yet more pathos. The address to the dead one occurs also at the outset of II 5 and often in the epigrams, e.g. *AP* VII 199 ὄρνεον ὦ χάρισιν μεμελημένον ὦ παρωμοῖον...ἡρπάσθης, φιλ' ἐλαιέ (Tymnes). For address beginning a poem in general, see II 1, 1-3n. For the frequency of the question in the *lamentatio*: II 1 *Intr.*

The bird is addressed, in a style akin to the hymn (*cf.* II 7, 5n.), by mentioning its relation to its fellow-birds (*dux*) and to its master (*domini...voluptas*). The most important characteristic is hinted at, *facunda*, and developed in 2; the same order occurs in 24-33: other birds, master.

1. Psittace: The parrot was already known to Aristotle, *HA* VIII 12, 597b. Its name, Greek: ψίτταχος, is probably Indian: Plin. *Nat.* X 117 *India hanc avem mittit, siptacen vocat, cf.* the doublets σιτταχός (Aelianus, Arrianus), σιτ(τ)αχή (Philostratus), βίτταχος (Ctesias), de Saint Denis on *Nat.* X 117 (ed. Budé, Paris 1961). Therefore *Eois, Eoae* (24-5n.).

It was popular in Rome for its exotic appearance (25) and its capacity for talking: Plin. *Nat.* X 117 *super omnia voces humanas reddunt, psittaci quidem etiam sermocinantes.* Apart from Pliny, its appearance, habits and training are described in Apul. *Fl.* 12, Sol. 52, 43-6, see the references in D'A. W. Thompson *s.v.* ψιτταχή and in André 1967 under *psittacus.* The parrot is mentioned twice in a context of literary criticism. Not as the poet 'parroting' others, but as a good poet opposed to bad poets (Pers. *prol.* 8, Mart. X 3, 7, see Sauvage 273). For ancient pictures of the parrot: Toynbee 249, 254, e.g. a mosaic from Pompeii with two doves and a parrot see 25n., 28n.

dux: For this transferred use of *dux*, see II 2, 10n. *Dux* and *ductor* for Domitian (III 2, 104, IV 3, 139) are different, *pace* Vollm., see II 7, 67n. The high-flown title underlines the pathos; *domini* following it is a pointed compliment to Melior.

volucrum: St. has *volucris* also in 26, *avis* 16, *ales* 17, 27, *aeria gens* 24. Ovid employs less different words for 'bird', he has them more often (*ales* 1, 9, 23, 55, *avis* 2, 20, 52, 54, 62, *volucris* 3, 51, 58), and he 'spends' them all within the first three verses. For other instances of Sts.' lexical variety and avoidance of common words compared to Ovid: see 17-23n., 33n.

voluptas: Both Herrlinger (89) and Sauvage (276) point out that *voluptas* is part of the amatory vocabulary, suggesting that in this way St. wants to remind us of the erotic element in Catullus and Ovid, *cf.* Colton 71, who refers to *Am.* II 6, 19 and 61 *dominae placuisse.* But its use as a term of endearment is not exclusive to love poetry: *Th.* III 295, VII 363 *o mihi sollicitum decus ac suprema voluptas/Antigone*, 775, Lucr. I 1 = VI 94 *hominum divumque voluptas* and Bailey's note on I 1, Mart. V 24, 1 and Versnel 1974, 377 ff., Verg. *A.* VIII 581. St. probably does not think of an erotic connotation.

facunda: (II 1, 113-9n.) Is inspired by Ovid 1-2 and 26 *garrulus.* St. often employs it for his friends, see II 2, 9-10n.

2. humanae...imitator...linguae: See *Am.* II 6, 1 and 37 *loquax humanae vocis imago*, 29n. St. emphasizes the tenuous difference between bird and man.

For the expression *humana lingua*, 'human language', see also Plin. *Nat.* X 119-20 *sermo humanus, sermones hominum.* For the implication that animals have *their* language, see the interesting remarks of Dierauer 31 n. 33, 189-91, 268 ff., Sells XIII-XXXIII.

3. quis...?: For the question as to the cause and reason of its death, implying criticism against the gods, see II 1, 38, II 6, 58-9 *quis deus* = V 1, 137. *Quis* here implies (*deus*) as well (one can hardly suppose that St. asks which of Melior's guests killed the bird). *Quis...subito...fato* almost = *cur subito*, see II 1, 137-9n.

The reasons for and circumstances of the parrot's death are apparently unknown to St., or he feigns not to know them for poetical reasons; hence there is no *descriptio morbi ac mortis*, only the pathetic details of 4 ff., illustrating the suddenness of its death. Barth thinks that the bird has died from staying up too late and Jennison suggests that it had eaten something which disagreed with it (perfectly probable in itself) 'parsley perhaps' (121). But St. does not intend us to be interested in this question.

For the topic *invidia deorum*, see II 1, 120, II 6, 58 ff., Ov. *Am.* II 6, 25 *raptus es invidia.*

murmura: For the imperfect speech of children, see II 1, 104-5n. It is used for non-talking birds in Ov. *Ars* II 466, Sil. III 680 (doves), and

may here point again both to the bird-like and the human qualities of the parrot. Thus it occurs at *Th.* VIII 619 and *Silv.* V 3, 83 for the nightingale in her role of the complaining Philomela, *cf.* 30n. (*queruli*).

The plur. *murmura* does not occur in prose, but often in Prop., Verg., Ov., since Lucr., see Schink 86-7.

praeclusit: 'Stifled': Liv. XXXIII 13, 5 *omnibus praeclusisse vocem videbatur.* Phaed. I 2, 26, I 23, 5-6 (a dog to a burglar who throws it some food) '*heus*' *inquit* '*linguam vis meam praecludere, ne latrem pro re domini?*'. St. may have especially in mind Ov. *Met.* II 658 *vocisque meae praecluditur usus* (by a metamorphosis).

St. has many composite verbs with *prae-*. A complete list of these compound verbs with *prae-* which do not occur in Vergil is given by Fortgens on *Th.* VI 4. *Praecludere* is amongst them. It is not used by Horace and Tibullus (Bömer on *Met. loc. cit.*). But it is found in Lucr. (4 x), Ov., Luc. (e.g. IX 739), Sil. (e.g. IX 511) and often in prose from Caesar and Cicero onward. Once more in St., *Ach.* I 256, in a different sense.

For Sts.' fondness of compound verbs in general: II 2, 118-20n.

fato: *Fatum* = death occurs often in St. and others, e.g. I 2, 102 *fata columbae*, III 3, 175 = V 3, 80, *Th.* I 627 with Heuvel's note, Luc. V 283, VFl. III 194, Sil. II 133, see *OLD* 5a.

4-7. Yesterday you have dined with us, poor parrot: The pathos is heightened in several ways: by continuing the address, but calling the bird explicitly *miserande*; by the contrast of now-yesterday-now (*at* 8); by the identification of bird and humans (it was a guest, *cf.* 30, 31); and finally by the small details (*cf.* II 1, 36-136n., II 6 *Intr.*). The whole is reinforced by the appeal to autopsy in *vidimus*, see II 1, 22n., II 6, 21 (21-33n.).

4. Hesternas: KQR, *externas*: M, *extremas*: Markland. *Hesternas* (all edd.) gives more point than *extremas*, which would destroy the juxtaposition with 9-10 (*externas* is, of course, meaningless). In IV 6, 16 the phrase *hesternas mensas* means 'a dinner-party which started yesterday and still continues', *cf.* also *Th.* II 161.

Vollmer quotes *AP* VII 198 κἀχθὲς ἔθ' ὑμνιδίῳ χηραμένην πατάγῳ but χθές is a conjecture, and Herrlinger prints καὶ θετ' ὑμνιδίῳ.

miserande: *Infelix* in *Am.* II 6, 20. St. is fond of the pathetic *miserandus*: he has it 13 times, 4 of which are voc. masc. (here, *Th.* V 246, IX 716, XI 678). Ovid has it 10 times (2 voc. masc.) and so has VFl. (4 voc. masc.). In the *Silvae* it occurs only in this poem (also in 23). I think that the use of this epic word, which St. does not employ in his serious *consolationes*, has a slightly parodistic intention.

moriturus: 'Though doomed to die': Mozley. For the future participle, see II 1, 52-4n.

dapes...insisti/nobiscum: I 6, 48 *nobiscum socias dapes insisti* (Domitian! See 15n.). *Inire* frequently for 'to enter and take part in (a social function or other joint activity)': *OLD* 2, Cic. *S.Rosc.* 52 *convivia non inibat, Leg.* II 63, Liv. IV 4, 11, Ov. *Fast.* IV 353-4 *cur...ineant convivia...concelebrentque dapes*, Sen. *Cl.* I 26, 2.

5. nobiscum: Its position heightens the pathos. This form occurs only here and at I 6, 48 in St. Together with I *Praef.* 28 and IV *Praef.* 17 *a nobis*, these are the only instances of the abl. of *nos* in St.

carpentem: 'Picking up the titbits from a table that you liked'. Sauvage calls this an interchangeable motif, which could equally well apply to a dog (276). But *carpere* may well be employed for a bird: it is generally said of cattle, especially goats, see *TLL* III 492, 36-72. Birds: Col. VIII 13, 2 (*anser*), esp. Plin. *Nat.* X 196 *alia dentibus praedantur, alia unguibus, alia rostri aduncitate carpunt...alia sugunt, alia lambunt, sorbent, mandunt, vorant.* Pliny imitates Cic. *N.D.* II 122 who employs *carpere* for cattle. Its use for dogs is not attested in *TLL*.

gratae: '*que tu aimais*': Fr., Traglia-Ar.; not '*reconnaissante*': Clouard. St. wants to contrast Melior's parrot with Corinna's: *plenus eras minimo* (*Am.* II 6, 29 ff.) and he implies a compliment for his host of the day before. We must interpret *gratae nobis* as well as *gratae ipsi psittaco.*

Perhaps Mart. II 69, 6 *en rogat ad cenam Melior te...rectam* also alludes to Melior's hospitality.

munera mensae: 'The dainties offered by the table', like II 1, 203 *munera mollis Elysii.*

For the ending, see *Th.* VIII 240 *foedera mensae*, XI 127 *funera mensae.*

Mensa is more frequent in the *Silvae* than in the epics (19/17), in accordance with their more informal content. For its meaning and the combination with *torus*, see Heuvel on *Th.* I 519.

6-7. errantem: The aimless hopping of the parrot. Usually for cattle (*TLL* V^1 807, 68 ff.), but see Mart. I 53, 7-8 *niger in ripis errat...corvus.* It expresses the same thing as Catul. 3, 9 *circumsiliens modo huc modo illuc.*

mediae plus tempore noctis: 'Until after the hour of midnight'. *Plus* = 'longer', see *Th.* II 197 *nec plura morati*, Pl. *Bac.* 818 *plus annis decem*, Cic. *Phil.* 2, 31 *plus quam decem dies.* Vollm. says, '*plus* gehört steigernd zu *mediae* (s. Nemes, *Ecl.* IV 72 *plus est formosus Iollas*); also noch nach Mitternacht'. This is not completely clear to me: *LHSz.* give a few examples of the use of *plus* with a positive adj. instead of a comparative before the second cent. (when it becomes more frequent). But they are different (*plus aequo pronus*: Hor., and others). Both the not uncommon use of *media*

nox = midnight (Pl. *Am.* 514, Cic. *Att.* IV 3, 4, Caes. *Gal.* II 7, 1, Prop. III 16, 1) and the abl. *tempore,* which one would automatically connect with *plus,* point rather to '(until) after the time of midnight' than to 'at a time after midnight'. The meaning is, of course, the same.

vidimus: For the appeal to autopsy, see II 1, 22n. For the enjambment, see II 1, 153-7n.

7-8. You have even talked to us: The bird had greeted the guests with a *salve* or χαῖρε = adfatus[11], see 29-30, and then spoken other words which it knew. These were possibly curses (see 15): *in vino praecipue lasciva* (sc. *verba pronuntiat*), says Pliny *Nat.* X 117 (after Arist. *HA* VIII 12, 597b).

meditata: II 1, 72-5n.

verba reddideras: To say the words you must say (because you have been taught so). Thus in 26, Plin. *Pan.* 26, 1-2 *labor erat parentibus...parvulos...blandas voces edocere. Reddebant illi quae monebantur.* Without the notion of having been taught: III 2, 134-5 *servataque reddere conloquia.*

reddideras for the metrically impossible *reddidisti.* The pluperf. without a difference in meaning from the perf. occurs often in Ov. and Prop.: *LHSz.* 321, Rothstein on Prop. I 3, 17, II 1, 113-9n. The pluperf. is very rare anyway. The indic. occurs only at II 1, 109 in this book. For the subjunctive, see II 1, 116, 140 ff., II 6, 62, 63, 65, 66, 83.

etiam: Not only were you hopping around, but you even showed us your cleverness; a preparation for *at nunc.*

8. At nunc: *AP* VII 189, 4 ἤδη γὰρ λειμῶνας ἐπὶ Κλυμένου πεπότηται, 191, 5 νῦν εἰς γᾶν κεῖμαι, 199, 4; 203, 4; 211, 3 νῦν δὲ τὸ κείνου φθέγμα νυκτὸς ἔχουσιν ὁδοί, 213, 5 νύν δέ σε...Ἄϊδος...ἀμφεκάλυψε μυχός, Catul. 3, 11 *qui nunc it per iter tenebricosum, CIL* VI 5, 54 (16n.), 1-15n.

The contrast then-now occurs, of course, also frequently in other kinds of poetry, e.g. in Catullus, see *Silv.* II 2, 32-3, 54-6, II 3, 15.

silentia Lethes: = II 6, 100, *cf.* II 1, 204 *mutas volucres* (n.). The silence is mentioned here in pointed contrast to *canorus.*

aeterna: *Cf.* I 3, 29 *aeterna quies* (Epicurean quiet, but with the association of death), Luc. IX 671, Sen. *Ag.* 592, *Oed.* 785, *aeternum...soporem* in Lucr. III 921, *aeternam...noctem* in Verg. *A.* X 745. *Aeternus sopor* and *aeterna quies* occur also often in inscriptions. See *OLD* 2b, Cancik 1978, 132 n. 85. Compare Catul. 3, 12 *illuc unde negant redire quemquam.*

9. ille: With the second person: Verg. *A.* IX 481, Ov. *Met.* XII 608-9, *Ep. Sapph.* 78, Sen. *Phaed.* 923, VFl. II 486, IV 329, VIII 10, *Prec. Ter.* 17, Tert. *Paenit.* 4, 3, see *TLL* VII 360, 17-20.

---

[11] *adfatus* and *affatus* are two different lemmas in the Concordance.

canorus: For the song of non-talking birds: Prop. II 34, 83, Hor. *Carm.* II 20, 15, Verg. *A.* VII 700 (all about swans, see *Silv.* V 3, 80-1 *morte canora*[12]...*olor* and 9-10n.), Verg. *G.* II 328 (various birds), the cry of a cock at Cic. *N.D.* II 57.

On the other hand, it is also used for human beings: an orator's loud voice, e.g. Cic. *Off.* I 133, Petr. 59, 3; a poet's tuneful voice: *Silv.* I 2, 225, III 5, 52 (*cf.* I 2, 3-4 *canoro...Helicone* and, about poetry, Hor. *Ep.* II 2, 76, *Ars* 322). For the significance of this use: 2n.

habes: Ov. *Rem.* 630 *alter...orbis habendus erit, OLD* 8a, *Silv.* II 7, 111-2 *nemus...tenes.*

Ovid makes much of the afterlife of the parrot in an *Elysium* for pious birds. The *Culex* wanders already through *Tartarus* and *Elysium* (*Culex* 214 ff.), but Ovid is the first to elaborate on the theme of the animal in *Elysium*, touched upon by Aristodicus (*AP* VII 189 above). But he modifies the concept: *si qua fides dubiis* (51). He also locates the *Elysium* of birds below the human *Elysium* (49 *colle sub Elysio*). St. is the first to say plainly that the bird is in the Underworld; he merely names *silentia Lethes*, though, without indulging in eschatological speculation (see at 36-7, however). For the same concept, see *CIL* VI 2, 10082 (= Herrlinger n° 53) *Speudusa Lethen incolis* (a horse) and Aus. *Carm.* 33, 8 *et gradere Elysios praepes ad alipedes.* The idea is literary, not popular: Herrlinger 85, 115-8.

9-10. cedat Phaethontia...fabula: *Phaethontia fabula*: the story about Phaethon's kinsman and friend Cycnus, who was transformed into a swan, see Ov. *Met.* II 367-80, Verg. *A.* X 185-97. At the same time St. alludes to another passage in Ovid, where he tells shortly before the story of Cycnus how Phaethon's chariot scorched the melodious swans in the Lydian river Caystros: II 252-3 *Et quae Maeonias celebrabant carmine ripas/flumineae volucres, medio caluere Caystro*, see *celebrant* and *canorus* here, Colton 75.

The word *Phaethontius* occurs for the first time in St. (only here and Silius VII 149, 206, X 110, 540, XVII 496). It stands always in the same position in the vs. But Ovid has in *Met.* XII 581 *volucrem Phaethontida* = the swan and II 226, IV 246 *Phaethonteus* (= *Th.* I 222). So the form is no great innovation; the meaning 'connected with Phaethon' is not as abstruse as it seems, *cf.* Mart. IV 32, 1 *Phaethontide gutta* = amber = the tears of Phaethon's sisters, VI 15, 1 *Phaethontea umbra* = the shade of poplars = Phaethon's metamorphosed sisters (for the more common designation of the sisters as *Phaethontides* or *Phaethontiades*, see *OLD*), II 3,

---

[12] In the Concordance under *cantare.*

60-1n. Silius, however, always uses *Phaethontius* of Phaethon himself. *Cf.* Schamberger 253-4.

For *cedat*, see II 1, 8-12n., II 2, 60-2n.

fabula vulgi: = I 2, 29, *cf.* V 3, 80 ff. *quas fati certus sibi morte canora praemittit olor...nota nimis vati.*

vulgus: 'the general public', *cf.* Cic. *Brut.* 183 *semperne vulgi iudicium cum intellegentium iudicio congruit?*, Ov. *Fast.* VI 25 *ne...volgi...errore traharis*, *OLD* 1a. See also Ov. *Met.* IV 53 *vulgaris fabula non est, Pont.* III 2, 97 *fabula...vulgaris.*

non soli celebrant sua funera cygni: St. ends the first part of the *lamentatio* with a hyperbolical mythological comparison: the parrot has celebrated its death, as the proverbial swan does, but by speaking instead of singing.

The idea that swans sing shortly before their death is widespread in antiquity. Aristotle confirmed it and only a few writers deny it, a.o. Alexander of Myndos (in Athen. IX 393d) and Pliny: *Nat.* X 63 *olorum morte narratur flebilis cantus, falso, ut arbitror, aliquot experimentis* (one wonders what these *experimenta* were). This fallacy (though there seems to be a glimmer of truth behind the idea, see Kroll 1924, 288) became a commonplace of literature since Aesch. *Ag.* 1444, see D'A. W. Thompson *s.v.* κύκνος 181-2, Kroll *loc. cit.*, *TLL* IV 1585, 16 ff., Bömer on Ov. *Fast.* II 109-10, Otto 1890 under *Cycnus* 3 and *Nachträge* 19, 55, 72, 151, 253, 267, Sauvage 237-9, Nisbet-H. on Hor. *Carm.* II 20, 10.

In Latin literature the theme is found in Cic. *Tusc.* I 73, *De Orat.* III 6, Ov. *Fast.* II 109-10, *Met.* XIV 429-30, *Ep.* 7, 1-2, *Tr.* V 1, 11-2, *Dirae* 1 and 97, Sen. *Phaed.* 201-2, *Ag.* 679-80, Sil. XI 437-8, Mart. V 37, 1, IX 42, 4, XIII 77, Fronto 113 (N), Hier. *Ep.* 52, 3 and 61, Ambros. *hex.* V 12, 39, Sid. *Ep.* VIII 9, 4, Prud. *Symm.* I 62-3, *Carmen de Phoen.* 47. In St. it occurs at *Silv.* III 3, 75, V 3, 80, *Th.* V 341[13].

In Latin the song is always a complaint, except for Cic. *Tusc.* which translates Plato *Phaedo* 85a-b. Sometimes the swan sings when it is not dying, see Sauvage 236-7.

celebrant: 'to observe a special occasion', see *OLD* 3; for weddings (Verg. *A.* VII 55), birthdays (Hor. *S.* II 2, 61) or funerals (Liv. X 29, 20).

11-5.: St. turns away sharply (*at*), to describe the bird's cage. Typically, he dwells on **1**) its costly and brilliant material (12 *ebori, argenteus*), see II 1, 36-136n., II 2, 85 ff. and notes, **2**) the contrast between the noise there once was and the silence which reigns now: *argutum, stridentia, querulae, convicia/vacat, nunquam.* As Vollm. says, St. lightly parodies II 1,

[13] II 4, 9-10 is not mentioned anywhere in the literature quoted above.

67 ff. *muta domus.* St. also touches on the *topos* of the dead one's behaviour, *cf.* II 1, 56-66n.

At: introduces a new subject, as in I 1, 46, I 2, 219, 273, II 7, 107, III 4, 99, IV 4, 56, V 3, 19, *Th.* VI 491, Luc. IX 815, Sil. II 632, 696 *al.* It is often combined with *apostrophe* (not here), also in Verg. and Ov., see Håk. 72, Merrill 94 (with parallels of unequal value).

Vollm. and Fr. construe a contrast: 'you are dead, but your house is beautiful', which is true in itself, but not implied by *at* here. Conjectures are superfluous (*a*: Brandes 580, usurped and printed by Phill., *ah*: Otto 1887, 533—not *an* as Håk. claims).

tibi quanta domus: For *quanta* conjectures have also been made: *stat viduata* (Heinsius), *quo tibi tanta* (Grasberger 772), *quo tibi comta* (Havet 181). St. is expressing delight and admiration at Melior's generosity, *cf.* II 1, 128-35n., 157-82n. He also implicitly contrasts the small bird with the great cage, *cf.* II 1, 175-8n.

domus: for a cage occurs only here and in II 5, 4, Claud. *Carm.* 24, 323; but it is often said of the nests of birds: *Th.* V 601, IX 360, *Ach.* I 373, since Lucr. I 18: *TLL* IV 1972, 17 ff. It leads over to the more audacious reference to the cage as an *augustum tectum*, which makes the identification bird/man more clear.

rutila testudine fulgens: *Testudo* is explained as '*tortoise-shell*' by Clouard, Fr., Sb., Traglia-Ar. and Jennison (120). Vollm. and Mozl. interpret it as 'dome': '*eine Kuppel aus übereinandergelegten roten (Gold?) Plättchen gebildet*'.

Neither of these meanings is impossible: *testudo*, 'tortoise-shell', is represented in St. as 'lyre' (V 3, 93, *Th.* X 309). Tortoise was an extremely expensive decoration, see Plin. *Nat.* XXXIII 42, 144, XXXVII 204 *in terra maxima dentibus elephantorum, in mari testudinum (maximum est pretium)*. It was used for decorating beds and walls, *cf.* e.g. Var. *L.* LX 47, Verg. *G.* II 463, Ov. *Met.* II 707-8, Luc. X 119 ff. It is mentioned together with ivory at Ov. *loc. cit.*, Luc. *loc. cit.*, Juv. 14, 308.

But 'dome', 'vault' has more probability: St. employs *testudo* in this sense in II 2, 17 and III 1, 101. Var. *R.* III 5, 1, III 6, 4, III 7, 3 already has the word in this sense, *cf.* Wistrand 16, II 2, 17-9n.

rutilus, moreover, is often employed for gold (discs here): Calp. *Ecl.* 6, 43, Luc. IX 364, Sen. *Oed.* 137, Juv. 15, 299, *cf.* André 1949, 87, 361[14]. Its range of application is but small and the only thing called *rutilus* which may resemble a tortoise is a species of the crab, whose colour is unknown to us: Plin. *Nat.* XI 99, see André *loc. cit.* The combination of gold and

---

[14] André 1949, 86 mentions this line without interpreting *testudine*. But he seems to imply that *rutilus* here is used for gold.

ivory is frequent: V 1, 2, *cf.* I 3, 49, already Enn. *scen.* 91 (Joc.). *Rutilus* and *fulgere* are also combined in Cic. *Arat.* 412; for *rutilus* with *radiare, lucere*, etc., see André 86.

So I think that St. means 'a cage bright with its (golden) dome and silver bars joined to ivory' (see below).

The cage is described from top to bottom, see II 1, 36-136n.

ebori: The cage itself is made of ivory, *cf.* Mart. XIV 77 *si tibi talis erit, qualem, dilecta Catullo/Lesbia, plorabas, hic habitare potest*, which is superscribed *cava eborea.* For another precious cage, see Petr. 28, 9 *cavea... aurea, in qua pica...intrantes salutabat* (see 18-9n.) and perhaps Petr. 119, 17-8 *tigris...aurata...in aula* (where Müller prints Brouckhusius' *aerata*).

virgarum argenteus ordo: 'A row of silver bars'. St. imitates Ov. *Met.* II 107-8 (the story of Phaethon) *aureus axis erat, temo aureus, aurea summae/curvatura rotae, radiorum argenteus ordo.* This may be an extra argument why *testudo* is not 'tortoise'. There seems to be only one other (rather far-fetched) parallel for *argenteus ordo*, Liv. X 39, 13 *auream...atque argenteam Samnitum aciem*, see Bömer on Ov. *loc. cit.* and *TLL* II 1518, 74 ff.

virgae for 'bars' has no good parallel either, but in Ov. *Ars* III 269 it refers to the vertical stripes on a garment and *virgatus* is 'dressed in such a garment' in Verg. *A.* VIII 660, VFl. II 159, Sil. IV 155.

argutum...tuo stridentia limina cornu et...fores: After a description of the cage, St. treats those parts of it which made and make noise. *Limina* and *fores* are synonyms here, *cf.* V 1, 163-4 *signatque fores et pectore terget limina* and Vollm. there, *Th.* IX 723 *fores et limina lassat.*

The poetic plur. *limina* occurs since Lucil. 1118 (Krenkel) and is often found in Catul., Lucr., Tib., Prop., Ov., *cf.* Schink 72-4, Bednara 558. St. has *limina* about four times as often as *limen*: 46 (+ 3) against 12 (e.g. II 7, 122).

The bird used to rattle the door of the cage with its beak (*cornu*). The cognate acc. (*argutum*) is especially frequent with words meaning 'to produce a sound', *canere, cantare, clamare, etc.*, e.g. Ov. *Am.* III 5, 6 *lene sonantis aquae*, Verg. *A.* VI 288 *horrendum stridens*, IX 705 *magnum stridens.* The adverb *argute* is not found in Tib., Prop., Verg., Ov. (*Met., Am., Tr., Pont.*) or St., see Priess 11 and 28-33[15].

et, querulae iam sponte, fores: *Fores* and *limina* must be taken closely together, so that *argutum stridentia* belongs to both, as Vollm. says. *Querulae iam sponte* refers to the present and means that the door of the cage now creaks of its own accord, without the parrot to rattle it. See II 5, 11-2 *stat cardine aperto infelix cavea.* Therefore we must *not* punctuate

[15] The Concordance puts *argutus* in II 1, 45 and here under *arguere.*

strongly after *cornu* as Håk. (72) recommends, 'because *querulae iam sponte* is much better coupled with what follows as a pathetic exclamation'. Some commentators also change *et* into *heu* (Phill.) or *en* (Markl.). But coupling *argutum...cornu* with what precedes, ruins the structure: there are 2 lines for a description of the cage, 3 for the noise with a contrast past/present (*iam* = 8 *nunc*), divided into 2 times one and a half lines.

et is connective: for *-que...-que...et*, see at II 5, 27.

querulae: also means that the cage is sad because its inhabitant has gone, see II 1, 67 *desolati penates* and for the inanimate subject see I 3, 25-6 *praetoria...queruntur*, I 5, 35, *cf.* I 4, 10 *sinum...questum*. Some commentators refer to *Th.* V 601 (Gevaert, Markl., Vollm., Håk. 72) *querulaeque domus mirata quietem*[16]. But that is irrelevant, for *querulae* there refers to the normal sound of birds, see *queruli* 30 and note.

vacat: For the thought, see *AP* VII 204 οὐκέτι πλεκτὸς οἶκος ἔχει σε, Louise Karschin, *Klagelied über den Tod eines Kanarienvogels zu Magdeburg 1761* (= Herrlinger *Anhang* no. 111): '*In tiefer Todesstille befand dein Häuschen sich*' and II 1, 67, II 5, 11-2.

beatus carcer: Oxymoron: *carcer* is sometimes used for the cage of a wild beast (Luc. IV 237, X 446), but the oxymoron is illustrated by Plin. *Nat.* X 141 *coepimus carcere animalia coercere, quibus rerum natura caelum adsignaverat.*

beatus sums up 11-2, 'magnificent', *cf.* I 2, 121, I 5, 43, IV 3, 85 *limite me colis beato*, V 1, 227 *beato toro.*

augusti...convicia tecti: *augusti*: M, most edd., *angusti*: σ, Clouard, *aurati*: Saeng. Håk. (72) claims that '*tectum* when used of a bird's cage needs *angustum* as a modification' and that IV 2, 18, the only other place where St. writes *tectum augustum* (for Domitian's palace), shows that *augustum* is wrong here. He suspects a weak echo of Verg. *A.* VIII 366 *et angusti subter fastigia tecti*, see also Aus. *Ephem.* 8, 36-7.

It can be added that *augustus* is not common in St.: III 2, 68 *usque adeone parum lentas transire paludes/stagnaque et augustas summittere pontibus amnes?* (in a diatribe against navigation. Most editors change into *angustos*), V 2, 19 *augustam sedem* (the Senate), IV 8, 20 *pater augustissimus* (Domitian). In all other places where M has got *augustus*, it must be changed into *angustus*: I 2, 123, II 7, 95, III 1, 69, III 2, 55.

Nevertheless, I think *augustus* is right here: *angustus* is not only colourless, but may even imply criticism of Melior (so does *carcer*, says Håk.; but that is *beatus*) and *beatus/carcer* and *augusti/convicia* are so well balanced in *pointe*, that I cannot believe that *angustus* is right, see also *regnator* 25 (n.). St. jokes about the 'palace' (IV 2, 18) of the cursing bird.

---

[16] Under *querela* in the Concordance.

For *convicia*, see Apul. *Fl.* 12 *si convicia docueris, conviciabitur diebus ac noctibus perstrepens maledictis. Hoc illi carmen est, hanc putat cantionem. Ubi omnia quae didicit maledicta percensuit, denuo repetit eandem cantilenam. Si carere convicio velis, lingua excidenda est aut...in silvas suas remittendus*, see 7-8n. The magpie is called *convicia* in Ov. *Met.* V 676 because of its cursing.

16-23.: St. exhorts other speaking birds to gather at the home of the parrot (*huc*, see II 1, 76-8n.). This is the *topos* of *Aufforderung zur Trauer* (E.-F. 126 § 1). In V 3, 89 ff. St. exhorts divine beings and authors to lament his father, in Ov. *Am.* III 9, 1 ff. Elegy must come to mourn for Tibullus. By asking birds to come, St. parodies the *topos*, after Ovid (*Am.* II 6, 3-14, *cf.* Catul. 3, 1-2), see *Intr.* Compare also II 1, 20, 175-7, V 1, 216-21, where the inhabitants of Rome lament Glaucias and Priscilla, and II 7, 1-23 where the inspirators of poetry are invited to celebrate Lucan's birthday.

St. asks the birds to lament (*plangat* 17, *gemitus* 22, see *queritur* 21), to take care of the funeral (22-3, in spite of 8-9 *silentia Lethes...habes*, see II 1, 153-7n.), and to sing a song (*carmen* 23n.). The whole is summed up in the three imperatives of 22-3 *ferte, ducite, addiscite.*

The catalogue consists of five birds: the raven, the starling, the magpie, the partridge and the nightingale. The last three birds allude to Ovid's *Met.*, which St. makes clear with *versae* (19) (one reason why Markland's *victae* is unnecessary). Of them the partridge and the nightingale are not well-known for their capacity to speak (see below).

16-7. doctae...aves: *Doctae* is explained by *ius fandi*, see *Am.* II 6, 62 *ora fuere mihi plus ave docta loqui*, Pers. *prol.* 9 *picam docuit nostra verba conari, CIL* VI 5, 54 *Hic sita sum varios avium perfingere cantus/docta avis...nuper herum studiis fessum curisque levabam* (see 30-1 here and II 1, 56-9), *nunc manes blandis mulceo rapta sonis* (see 8 here).

Note how St. invites the train of *doctus Phoebus* in V 3, 91.

stipentur: 'To crowd', see *Th.* V 101 *huc...stipamur*, IX 245 *stipantur in algas.* Ovid asks the birds *in funus devertere* (*Am.* II 6, 9, *exequias ite* 2, *dole* 12), after a comical description of how they are to mourn.

quis...fandi ius Natura dedit: *Quis* for *quibus.* Both in his epics and in the *Silvae* St. slightly prefers *quis* over *quibus*: 25 to 14 in the epics and 6 to 3 in the *Silv.* (not counting *quibus* in I *Praef.* 32). This is probably because *quis...quis* is easier to fit into one line (e.g. *Th.* IV 22, XI 479) than *quibus.* He mixes the two in V 3, 92-3, *cf.* Heuvel on *Th.* I 224 (who wrongly takes *Th.* I 707 *quis* as *quibus*), Fortgens on VI 251, in general Neue-W. II 469-70, *LHSz.* I 473[17].

---

[17] The Concordance is unreliable.

For *fandi*, see e.g. I 4, 35 *fandique opibus...abundas*, V 5, 49-50 *copia fandi nulla mihi*.

Natura, though talking birds could well be called 'unnatural', see II 1, 34n.

17-23. plangat: = *ferte gemitus* in 22. Note the different words referring to the birds' talking: *fandi, plangat, dimittere voces, refert vocabula, queritur, ferte gemitus*, see *adfatus...verba reddideras* (7-8), *salutator, locutus* (29). See II 1, 2n., 128-35n., 157-82n., II 2, 49-51n., II 3, 1-7n., also 1n. here and on *eras* in 33.

Phoebeius ales: The raven, see Ov. *Met.* II 544 *ales...Phoebeius, ibid.* 535 *corve loquax.* It is associated with Apollo since Hes. *frgm.* 50-60, frequently since Callimachus' *Hecale* (see also *Hymn. ad Apoll.* 2, 66 where Apollo is called κόραξ), see Ov. *Fast.* II 249, *Met.* V 329, Man. I 410, Petr. 122, 177, Sil. V 78-9, *cf.* Bömer on Ov. *Met.* II 544 and *TLL* IV 1079, 31 ff.

For its capacity to talk, *cf.* Var. *L.* VI 56, Plin. *Nat.* X 121-4, Apul. *Fl.* 12, 45 *corvus et psittacus nihil aliud quam quod didicerunt pronuntiant* and the stories about a raven which saluted emperors (20-32n.)[18].

Possibly St. also puts the *corvus* first because its black colour is in accordance with the tragic occasion (see Ov. *Met.* II 531-41, 631-2, where the change from a white into a black bird is told, which is a punishment by Phoebus). Ravens are, however, not automatically seen as gloomy in Latin, *cf.* Sauvage 89-90.

18-9. auditasque memor penitus dimittere voces sturnus: 'And the starling, with its excellent memory able to speak words'. *Dimittere*: M, *demittere*: Poliziano, (see van Dam 394-5). *Demittere* is recommended by Kl. and Fr., accepted by Jennison 118, and printed by most editors. Vollm., Postg., Saeng. and Mozl. print *dimittere*[19].

demittere means 'to store up in memory', *cf.* Liv. XXXIV 50, 2 *ut eas voces...in pectora animosque demitterent*, Plin. *Nat.* X 120 (about a starling and nightingales, see below) *adsidente qui crebro dicat quae condita velit.*

For *dimittere* 'to emit' *TLL* V¹ 1214, 7-10, who explains thus, offers no suitable parallel: Quint. *Inst.* XI 3, 81 *labra vocem tantum altera parte dimit-*

---

[18] Poe writes about the composition of his Raven: 'Here, then immediately arose the idea of a non-reasoning creature capable of speech; and, very naturally, a parrot, in the first instance, suggested itself, but was superseded forthwith by a Raven, as equally capable of speech, and infinitely more in keeping with the intended tone'. (*Selected writings* pp. 485-6, Penguin-edition).

[19] Traglia-Aricò also have *dimittere*, but this seems to be a misprint, for they translate *demittere*, which Traglia also prints in his edition.

tunt rather means 'to let through'. Sil. VII 257 *murmura venti dimittunt* is also different.

On the other hand, speaking, not retaining in memory, is mentioned throughout in this catalogue and *auditas memor dimittere* is also suggested by 31 *monstrata reddere.*

OLD (3b) puts *memor* (as the sole instance) under 'having a memory able to'. With *demittere* this is somewhat pleonastic, whereas with *dimittere* both the bird's memory and capacity of speech are mentioned, see Plin. *Nat.* X 118 (magpies) *constat...nisi subinde eadem audiunt, memoria falli quaerentesque mirum in modum hilarari, si interim audierint id verbum.*

So I choose *memor dimittere*[20]. *Penitus* goes with *memor* then, *cf.* IV 4, 101 *penitus voti* ('wholly devoted'). The inf. follows *memor* since Ovid, see *Am.* III 14, 8 *sit modo 'non feci' dicere lingua memor.*

The first mention of the starling (*sturnus*) in Latin is Plin. *Nat.* X 72-3, though the word is ancient (see André 1967 under *sturnus*), further e.g. Plin. *Nat.* XVIII 160, Mart. IX 54, 7, *Priap.* 61, 10, *SHA Commodus* 10, 4, *cf.* II *RE* III^2 2150-1. For its talking see *Nat.* X 120 *cum haec proderem, habebant et Caesares* (Brittanicus and Nero) *iuvenes sturnum, item luscinias Graeco et Latino sermone dociles, praeterea meditantes assidue et in diem nova loquentes*, Shakespeare *Henry IV* Pt. I, I 3, 224-5 (quoted by Jennison 118) 'I'll have a starling shall be taught to speak/nothing but "Mortimer" '.

19. Aonio versae certamine picae: 'And the magpies changed by the Boeotian contest'. The reference is to Ov. *Met.* V 294 ff. where the nine daughters of the Macedonian king Pieros provoke the Muses to a singing contest and after their defeat are changed into magpies: *nunc quoque in alitibus facundia prisca remansit/raucaque garrulitas studiumque immane loquendi* (677-8).

It is not certain if Ovid (and St.) by *pica* mean the jay (*pica glandaris*), the only kind that can talk according to Pliny, *Nat.* X 118 (wrongly), or the magpie (*pica pica*), which was still rare when Pliny wrote (*ibid.* 78). André 1967 under *pica* concludes the last, Bömer on *Met.* V 294 ff. (pp. 297-9), who states that the word is first met in Ovid, suspends a choice. See there also for the legend and its sources.

For the loquacity of the magpie, see Petr. 28, 9 (quoted on 11-5 above), Pers. *prol.* 13 *corvos poetas et poetrides picas*, Plin. *Nat.* X 118-9, Mart. VII 87, 6, IX 54, 9, XIV 76, Macr. *Sat.* II 4, 30.

Aonius (also II 7, 13) is 'Boeotian', a very frequent metonymy since Hellenistic times. It is favourite in Ov. (see Bömer on *Met.* I 313) and St., who has *Boeotius* once, *Boeotus* 3 times, *Heliconius* 4 times and *Aonius*

[20] Abandoning my former opinion (1980, 395).

47 times. The contest is called Boeotian, because it was held on Mt. Helicon or with the Muses, see Ov. *Met.* V 307, 663, *TLL* II 204, 58-9 '*ad Boeotiam spectat indeque ad Musas*'.

20. quique refert iungens iterata vocabula perdix: 'And the partridge, which joins in speaking the repeated words'. The reference is to Ov. *Met.* VIII 236 ff., the metamorphosis of Daedalus' nephew Perdix into the like-named bird (*garrula* 237, *cantu* 238). This explains that it is ranged under the birds with the *ius fandi*, for I cannot share Vollmer's belief '*es wird also wohl auch sprechende Rebhühner gegeben haben*'. So Sabellicus' *cornix*[21] is unnecessary, *cf.* van Dam 395-6, also for more details. Moreover, its typical cry (κακκαβίζειν, *cf.* Vollm., D'A. W. Thompson, André 1967 *s.v.*) and the idea that man learnt music from the partridge (Athen. IX 389 F ff. = Alcman *frg.* 39 (Page) and Chamaeleon *frg.* 24 (Köpke)) make its inclusion here easier, see below on the nightingale. Its 'trre ttra tri tru' repeated (André *loc. cit.*) is described as *iterata vocabula iungens*: 'trre' *etc.* are pronounced without a break between two trr's = *iungens*, see van Dam 383, Quint. *Inst.* IX 4, 108 *illud 'ore excipere liceret' si iungas lascivi carminis est, sed interpunctis quibusdam fit plenum auctoritatis.* It is pronounced again and again = *iterata.*

For the subject within the relative clause here and in the next vs. and vs. 28 see at II 2, 80.

21. quae Bistonio queritur soror orba cubili: 'The bereaved sister who complains about the Thracian bedroom'. The reference is to the story of Procne, Philomela and Tereus, see Ov. *Met.* VI 424-674, *Silv.* II 1, 140. But the details are not clear. In Greek literature the story is always told as follows.

Procne was married to Tereus, king of Thrace. He raped Procne's sister Philomela. Procne, helped by Philomela, killed her son Itys and served him to Tereus. Tereus pursued the women, but was transformed into a hoopoe. Philomela became a swallow, Procne a nightingale (e.g. Aesch. *Agam.* 1140 ff., see H. J. Rose 262-3, Bömer on *Met.* VI 412 ff. = pp. 115-7).

It is frequently stated that in Latin poetry Philomela becomes the nightingale and Procne the swallow (e.g. Rose *loc. cit.*, Bömer on *Met.* VI 669). In fact, often it is unclear, and often Procne becomes the nightingale in Latin too: before Vergil the Greek version is followed (Var. *L.* 76; indefinite: Pl. *Rud.* 604; another Greek version: Catul. 65, 13-4). But in Verg. *G.* IV 15 Procne becomes the swallow, also in Ov.

---

[21] The conjecture can be found in J. Gruter, *Lampas* (Frankfurt a/Main 1602) I, 162. Sabellicus died in 1506.

Ars II 383 ff., *Tr.* III 12, 9, *Fast.* II 853 ff. I think two basic assumptions must be made: the complaining bird is always the nightingale (unless the contrary is explicitly stated, as in Ov. *Fast.* II 853), for the swallow does not sing. And the wife of Tereus is always Procne. If in Latin variations Philomela were sometimes the wife of Tereus (as is assumed by André 1967 under *Philomela*) the whole question would turn around, but there is no evidence at all for this assumption.

Then Procne becomes the nightingale in Ov. *Tr.* II 390 and V 1, 60, *Silv.* III 3, 175-6: the song of *saevi marita/Tereos.* Philomela becomes the nightingale in Verg. *Ecl.* 6, 78 ff. (probably), Sen. *Her.F.* 149, *Perv. Ven.* 86, *Silv.* V 3, 83-4, *al.* In his account in *Met.* VI Ovid does not mention which woman becomes which bird. For this complex question see also Sauvage 193, Frentz 93-7.

Here the nightingale is represented as the mother of Itys and the wife of Tereus, for she is *orba*, bereft of child, sister and husband, so I assume that here St. means not Philomela (as all commentators except for Fr. suppose), but Procne (Fr. 76 n. 3). Clouard does not choose.

In a few words St. sketches the whole story: the nightingale is called *soror*, which brings in the motive of the raped sister, and she is *orba Bistonio cubili* 'the widow of a Thracian bed', i.e. the wife of Tereus. She *queritur* because of her slain son (Mozley's 'forlorn in her Bistonian bower' is weak).

The nightingale and/or Philomela occur frequently in *epicedia*, see E.-F. § 78 under *Philomela* and § 82 under *Nachtigall.* For Greek verse-inscriptions, see Vérilhac II § 164. The fact that the story is told by Ovid in the *Met.* and that the nightingale is singled out for special mention in *Am.* II 6 as a bird which must lament (7-10) are the main reason for its mention here. That the Caesars had nightingales (*lusciniae*) which talked is rather irrelevant, the more so since this seems to be the only mention of this feat in the whole of ornithological history, *cf.* the partridge above (20n.) and van Dam 396.

Bistonius: 'Thracian', also in I 1, 18, *Th.* II 587, VI 665, VII 7, XI 194, see *Bistonis* in *Th.* V 142. St. has many synonyms for 'Thracian': *Edonus, Geticus* (II 2, 61n.), *Odrysius, Ismarius, Rhodopeius* (e.g. *Th.* V 121 *Rhodopeia coniunx* = Procne), *Strymonius*, see Heuvel on *Th.* I 275, Mulder on II 587, Schubert 55, Lunderstedt 18, 27-8. *Bistonius* occurs since Lucr. V 31.

22-3. ferte simul gemitus: See II 1, 35 *confer gemitus* (n.), V 1, 221 (the citizens) *lacrimas fudere marito.*

cognata...ducite flammis funera: *Cognata* because they are all speaking birds.

ducite: V 1, 218 *natos suprema ad busta ferentem, Epic. Drusi* 173 *funera ducuntur Romana per oppida Drusi*, see II 1, 20-1n., 177-8.

For *funera* 'corpse', see II 1, 22n.

hoc...carmen: St. exhorts the birds to learn a *carmen* to sing. That is to say he ends his poem with another poem. This seems to be an original finale.

Some devices which St. employs elsewhere in the *Silvae* resemble Sts.' technique here: in IV 4 St. speaks to his letter, then the letter speaks, and St. finishes with some words 'of his own' (this is akin to Ovid's technique of speaking to his book of poems, esp. in the *Tristia* and *Ex Ponto*, see Hor. *Ep.* I 20, but there the letter is not *part* of the poem itself. Likewise the way in which St. often lets gods speak in his poems is different (II 7, 41 ff., III 1, 166 ff. *etc.*)). To a certain extent IV 6, 99 ff. is comparable: after having described the fate of the statue of Hercules, St. says that its present owner, Vindex, will celebrate Hercules (*hic tibi sollemni memorabit carmine*) and then goes on to mention elements of this celebration (*quantus...terrueris* ff.). In this way he slides imperceptibly into the hymn, which not infrequently closes a Latin poem (G. Williams 273), but he goes one step further in characterizing it explicitly as a *carmen*, see *concinet* in 105 there.

Here he sings to the birds the poem that they must learn so that they can sing it at the cremation. It stands on one line with his own *carmina*, e.g. those for consolation, *cf.* II 1, 5-6 *cantus/confero*, 17 *carmine in ipso*.

The idea of the poem within the poem is, of course, not entirely new: the song of the *Parcae* in Catul. 64 (323 ff.) is an instance of it, and it occurs also in Vergil's Eclogues: besides the poetic contests of *Ecl.* 3 and 7, *carmina* of fictional persons are quoted in 5 (20 ff., 56 ff.), 6 (31 ff.), 8 (17 ff., 64 ff.) and 9 (27-9, 39 ff.). A cognate technique is the employment of different speakers in one poem, like Prop. I 16, where the door speaks and in the middle of its words quotes the lover's complaint, *cf.* for this technique Cairns 1972, 177-217 and 230-1.

St., however, puts the poem-within-the-poem to a very clever use: it is not simply a poem by someone else whom he quotes (e.g. Verg. *Ecl.* 6), but it is a logical continuation of his own poem (as, for instance, in Catul. 64) with *laudatio, lamentatio* and *descriptio funeris*. St. sings the song to the birds, and, as it were, is quoting his own poetry, for the birds to produce at the right moment. In this way he exploits the idea of talking birds. For similar devices of St., see II 1, 189-90n., II 3, 62-3n.

Nevertheless, incongruities are not completely eradicated: the birds could hardly call Melior *dilecte* (32), which is said *e persona Statii*. Moreover, the parrot is considered to be in Elysium (8-9), while the birds must learn the song to perform it at the funeral. Similarly in IV 4

the letter can hardly say 49 ff., especially not *magni tumulis adcanto magistri* (55).

miserandum: 'Of lament', distinct from its meaning in 4, *cf.* II 2, 70n. See Man. V 559 *fleverunt tuos miserando carmine casus*, Luc. VIII 638-9 *miserandis aethera complet vocibus*, and also V 3, 1 *lamentabile carmen*, V 5, 33 *illaudabile carmen, Epic. Drusi* 3 *miserabile...carmen.*

addiscite: A technical term for the learning of talking birds, *cf.* Plin. *Nat.* X 119, probably 124. It also means 'to learn things (words) which you did not know before', see *OLD* 1a and Vollm.

24-37.: The song which St. teaches the birds. It consists of *laudatio* (24-33), with the *lamentatio* represented by *occidit* (see II 1 *Intr.*, II 1, 36-136n.): *genus* (24), *forma corporis* (25-9), *indoles animi* (29-33), *cf.* E.-F. 131 § 11, 135 § 25, Herrlinger 89 (differently: E.-F. 118 n. 3).

The praise of its appearance consists of an *Überbietungsformel* (see II 1, 8-12n). It employs the concept of splendour by referring to costly metals. The praise of its capacities connects the bird with kings and the emperor on the one hand, with its owner on the other hand. Thence the impression is given that all the world (exoticism 25-8), especially the powerful creatures (both beast and man) come to mourn the parrot (see II 1, 175-8n., II 2, 74-5n.).

Consolatio and *funus* are packed into one, since the luxury of the funeral more or less serves as comfort (33-7). *At* (33) contrasts with *occidit* (23), like *gloria* (24) with *inglorius* (33). If *funus* and *consolatio* must be separated, 33-4 belong to both, or are a formula leading over to *funus*, and the final hyperbole in 36-7, where eternal life is implied, belongs rather to *consolatio.*

The aromatic spices at the funeral, always present in St., not only point again to the *topos* 'all the world' opposed to 'one small parrot', but lead up aptly to the phoenix (see there). It seems that Melior really organized a cremation for the parrot, see *Intr.* under **II.**

24-5. occidit: See Ov. *Am.* II 6, 1-2 (quoted in 1-3n.), *Epic. Drusi* 13 *occidit exemplum iuvenis venerabile morum*, Mart. VII 40, 5. In St.: *Th.* V 537-8 *occidis...destrictus verbere caudae*, see V 2, 64-5 *fatis namque haustus iniquis/ occidit.*

aeriae celeberrima gloria gentis: St. tries to surpass Ov. with his hyperboles: *gloria* is also in Ovid: vs. 20 *infelix, avium gloria, nempe iaces.* But *celeberrima* (see *dux* in 1. St. always employs *celeber* in the superlative, four times in all) adds to it and the periphrase *aeria gens* sums up Ovid's *quae liquido libratis in aere cursus* (11).

Both *gloria* and *aeria gens* show the parody: *gloria* for persons or things is sometimes used as it is here by St.: V 1, 151 *silvarum gloria pinus, Th.* XII 51-2 *lucorum gloria...trabes*, see VII 226, VIII 707, IX 195, but also Mart. *Sp.* 18, 2 *tigris ab Hyrcano gloria rara iugo.* But it occurs often in a high flown context: *Th.* VI 340 *Iasonides, nova gloria matris*, Verg. *A.* VI 767 *Procas, Troianae gloria gentis* (where Norden suggests an Ennian origin), Ov. *Met.* XII 530 *Lapithaeae gloria gentis.* See also Mart. IX 71, 1 *Massyli leo fama iugi*, II 2, 9-12n. (*regina*).

The periphrase *aeria gens* is also epic, *cf.* Man. V 568 *aerios populos, Th.* V 331 *adultae gloria gentis* (calves).

For the ending, see *Th.* IV 242 *ea gloria genti*, V 331, Luc. X 284.

The mention of *genus* (*aeriae gentis*) is topical, *cf.* II 1, 72-5n., E.-F. 131 § 11, also in other kinds of poems: I 1, 74, I 2, 70 ff., III 3, 111 ff., V 2, 15 ff.

psittacus: In 1 St. changed the case of the first word in Ovid (1-3n.), here he retains both *psittacus* and *occidit* in the same position in the line, but he interchanges them. For the enjambment, see 6-7n.

plagae...Eoae: *Patria* is mentioned, *cf.* E.-F. 132 §§ 13 and 17. The green Indian parrot seems to have been the only one known to the Romans, while the grey African parrot, 'a much better talker' (Jennison 120), is not named in our sources. The grey African parrot, however, is probably meant in Plin. *Nat.* VI 184: on an expedition into Ethiopia *insulam Gagauden...inde primum visas aves psittacos.* Jennison (*loc. cit.*) tentatively identifies the parrots on a dish from Lampsacus as grey African parrots.

For *Eoae*, see Plin. *Nat.* X 117 and Ov. *Am.* II 6, 1 at 1n.

viridis regnator: *Viridis* is the only colour which is mentioned for the parrot, see *Epist. Sapph.* 38 *viridis avis*, Claud. *In Eutr.* II 329 (quoted in the *Intr.* under **II**), *cf.* Sauvage 273. In Ov. it is *rari coloris* (17).

regnator is a word which St. always employs in an exalted context: for Jove (*Th.* V 688, VIII 41, IX 421, *Ach.* I 588), Dis (*Th.* XI 410), the king of Scyros (*Ach.* I 293), Alexander (IV 6, 60, 160), Domitian (IV 2, 14), Pindar (IV 7, 5) and once for a bull which St. compares to Eteocles (*Th.* XI 251). This implies, I think, a parodistic intent here and makes *augustus* (15) more probable.

26-8. quem non...vinceret aspectu: Three birds are mentioned which are less beautiful than the parrot. After *patria*, St. treats *forma*, see II 1, 36-136n. St. has imitated Ovid's *tu poteras fragiles pinnis hebetare zmaragdos/ tincta gerens rubro Punica rostra croco* (21-22) by the simple *viridis* and by these comparisons with the peacock, the pheasant and the guinea-fowl,

esp. *gemmata* (26). Note that the peacock also occurs in Ov. (55) in a different context, as a *pia volucris* in Elysium.

gemmata volucris Iunonia cauda: The periphrase *volucris Iunonia* occurs also in Ov. *Ars* I 625, *Med. Fac.* 33, *Met.* XV 385, Juv. 7, 32, Claud. *Eutr.* II 330, *Rapt. Pros.* II 97. See for its jewelled tail Ov. *Met.* I 722-3 *volucrisque suae Saturnia pennis/conlocat et gemmis caudam stellantibus implet.* In ancient Greece the bird was likewise sacred to Hera (Bömer on *Met.* I 722-3), but no equivalent for this periphrase seems to be found in Greek poetry (Sauvage 271).

Its beauty is often remarked upon since Lucr. II 502-3, 806-7: Var. *R.* III 6, 2. *Huic enim natura formae e volucribus dedit palmam*, Col. VIII 11, 8, Plin. *Nat.* X 43. The mention of gems in connection with it occurs since Ov. *Met. loc. cit.*, see Phaed. III 18, 8 *gemmeam caudam explicas*, Col. VIII 11, 8 *caudae gemmantibus pinnis*, Plin. *loc. cit. gemmantes colores*, Mart. III 58, 13 *gemmei pavones*, XIII 70, *Anth.Lat.* 199, 70 *gemmatam pinnis caudam*, Pallad. I 28, 2 *amictum caudae gemmantis*, *cf.* Ov. *Met.* XV 385 *quae cauda sidera portat*, Claud. *Eutr.* II 330, Prop. II 24, 11 *cauda superba*, followed by Ov. *Ars, Med. Fac. locc. citt.*, Mart. XIV 67, see *RE* XIX 2, 1419-20, Otto 1890, no. 1362. In Greek only Esopus 333 mentions gold (Sauvage 268-9). Vollmer, followed by Fr. 77 n. 1, inadvertently remarks that peacock, pheasant and guinea-fowl are also mentioned at I 6, 77 ff., but, as is clear from his own and Frère's notes *ad. loc.*, the peacock is not mentioned there.

See also Karl Wilhelm Ramler, *Nänie auf der Tod einer Wachtel* (Herrl. *Anhang* no. 112, 18th cent.) vs. 21: '*Ach! kein Vogel war diesem gleich: der Juno/Vogel nicht, der nur altklug ist, nicht scherzet*'.

gelidi...Phasidis ales: The pheasant. It was imported from Colchis at the river Phasis (Rion), the south-eastern coast of the Black Sea. It is first mentioned in Latin by Col. VIII 8, as an exotic and expensive bird, probably known from Ptolemaic Egypt, where it was kept for the table and for its beauty (Jennison 109-110). In Pliny's time pheasants were in Italy (*Nat.* X 132 *omnesque iam in Italia*, also about the guinea-fowl), and probably somewhat earlier, for they were sacrificed to Caligula in his temple in Rome (Suet. *Cal.* 22, 3). It appears first in poetry at Petr. 93, 2 and 119, 36-37 (first in St.: wrongly Sauvage 267 n. 65); but its beauty is mentioned only here and *Anth.Lat.* I 1, 132 (*praefulgere, rubor, radii, igneus, micare, lucere, floridus, flammeus, rutilus*). The gold pheasant seems to have been unknown to the ancients, *cf.* Sauvage 267, *RE* VI 2001-2.

gelidi...Phasidis: cf. I 6, 77 *horridus Phasis, Th.* XII 182 *nivosi Phasidis.* If the adj. has any force here, it is to oppose hot and cold regions: *umenti* (28), *cf.* II 5, 27-30n.

quas...Numidae rapuere: 'The birds which the Numidians catch', *viz.* the guinea-fowl. Descriptions of it are rare in Latin: Col. VIII 2, 2, Var. *R.* III 9, 18, Plin. *Nat.* X 74 (with De Saint Denis' note), Mart. III 58, 15 *Numidicae guttatae*, 'spotted'.

Several varieties seem to have been known in Rome, some introduced soon after the Punic wars, others later, *cf.* André 1967 under *avis Afra, gallina Africana, (avis) Numidica, Meleagris, RE* XIX 1, 865-7.

From a modern point of view one could suppose that St. alludes to gems, gold, silver respectively, but as the gold pheasant seems to have been unknown, and as in the appearance of the guinea-fowl only its spots were remarked on, this seems impossible (*cf.* Sauvage 115-6 who argues that the plumage of birds is rarely described in Latin poetry, or, if it is, in worn phrases).

The only thing for which the guinea-fowl *was* noted, is its flesh, and it often appears together with the pheasant as a luxury food: *Silv.* I 6, 77-8, Petr. 53, 6 and 93, 2, Mart. III 58, 15 and 77, 4, XIII 45, 1, Juv. 11, 139-42 (with Friedländer). It is mentioned without the pheasant as food at Var. *R.* III 9, 17, Hor. *Epod.* 2, 53 (first mention in poetry), Col. VIII 12, *cf.* Suet. *Cal.* 22, 3, Jennison 107-8, *RE loc. cit.* The pheasant is mentioned as food at *Silv.* IV 6, 8-9, Col. VIII 8, 10, Plin. *Nat.* XIX 52, *cf.* Friedländer *SG* III[10] 308. One might almost think that Sts.' subconscious association here is culinary, *cf.* André on Apic. p. 136: '*la pintade, le paon et le faisan ont orné les seules tables des riches, des parvenus, des princes*'. The three are also combined at Mart. III 58, 13-6, Suet. *Cal.* 22, 3.

For the gnomic perfect, see II 6, 20n.

umenti...sub austro: Almost = I 6, 78 *quas udo Numidae legunt sub austro. Umenti austro* is a periphrase to designate 'the south', which is called 'humid', because the south wind is frequently associated with rain, *umidus auster*: Verg. *A.* I 462, Vitr. VIII 2, 5, Plin. *Nat.* II 126, X 66, *imbriferus* in Ov. *Met.* XIII 725, *madens* in Sen. *Her. O* 71, see *Silv.* III 1, 72-3 *graviore Favonius Austro/immaduit.* Gel. II 22, 14 *Latine 'auster', Graece* νοτίς *nominatur quoniam est nebulosus atque umectus.* Νοτίς *enim Graece humor nominatur*, see *TLL* II 1552, 71 ff.

Here, I think, 'the south' rather than the 'south wind' is meant, *cf.* Luc. VIII 442 *regna proiecta sub austro.* Vollmer's explanation (at I 6 *loc. cit.*) '*bei feuchtem Winde war der Fang am leichtesten*' is entirely fictional.

29-33.: The capacity of the parrot to speak is praised in all its aspects: *salutator, locutus, queruli, reddere...facilis.* Lines 30-3 recall II 1, 56 ff. The parts of the sentence are variously joined: *-que et, asyndeton, que, quo recluso.* It ends with a pathetic address to the owner of the parrot, who is mentioned here (32) for the first time, see II 1, 166-8n.

29-30. ille: See *ille* in 25, II 6, 97-100 *ille...ille...illic...illic* in the same pathetic context, *ille* in 9 here.

salutator regum nomenque locutus Caesareum: 'It was the loyal and correct thing to teach one's parrot to say *Ave Caesar.* The birds were taught the conventional greeting χαῖρε': Jennison 120, see Plin. *Nat.* X 117 *imperatores salutat,* Pers. *prol.* 8 *quis expedivit psittacum suum chaere,* Mart. XIV 73 *psittacus a vobis aliorum nomina discam:/hoc didici per me dicere: Caesar have,* Macr. *Sat.* II 4, 30, *cf.* the last words of Corinna's parrot '*Corinna vale*' (48).

Greeting of emperors and other persons is told of other birds: Macr. *Sat.* II 4, 29-30 tells about several ravens and a magpie which could greet Octavian and Antony. Plin. *Nat.* X 121-3 mentions a raven which greeted Tiberius, Germanicus, Drusus and the Roman citizens passing below it (which makes Barth, in a wave of democratic enthusiasm, claim superiority for this raven over Melior's parrot), *cf.* Phaed. *Appendix* 21, 9-10.

salutator occurs first in poetry here (in prose in Cic. and Quint.). It is found several times in Mart., *cf.* Schamberger 264.

Caesareum: *Caesaris* (11 times) and *Caesareus* (10 times) occur without any apparent difference (e.g. III 5, 29 *Caesaris auro*/IV 5, 24 *Caesareo...auro*), except metrical convenience of the moment. One might, however, think that *Caesareum* gives a more grandiose touch here, see Marouzeau 1935, 220-1, Löfstedt 1942², 107-24, esp. 121 n. 2. *Caesareus* occurs only in poetry and elevated prose, see II 1, 144-5n.

quondam...nunc: Is *modo...modo,* see II 1, 131-5n. Wölfflin (1885), in an essay called '*was heisst bald...bald?*', has no instance with *quondam.*

queruli...amici: 'A sympathetic friend when you were sad': The parrot complained together with Melior, perhaps to comfort him for the death of his loved ones, *cf.* the instances at 22-3n., II 6, 52 *tecum tristisque hilarisque* and *CIL* VI 5, 16 (quoted at 16-7n.).

But *querulus* and *queri* are also used to designate the singing, twittering *etc.* of birds (11-5n.). '*Queror*/*querela* ...ne traduisent pas toujours la tristesse et le deuil': Sauvage 123, see *Silv.* IV 5, 10-1 *volucrum novi*/*questus, Th.* V 601 (at 11-5n.), Hor. *Epod.* 2, 26, Ov. *Am.* III 1, 4, *Med.* 77, *Ep. Sapph.* 152, Sen. *Phaed.* 508 *hinc aves querulae fremunt. Cf.* Verg. *G.* III 328 *querulae cicadae.* So the special birdlike aspects of the parrot are again combined with its human qualities: *amici.*

31-3. conviva levis: For *conviva*, see 4-6. *Levis* is 'gay'. It contrasts with *queruli,* so Guyet's explanation '*Minimi sumptus*' is wrong, the more so since St. wants to contrast Melior's parrot with Corinna's frugal one (5n.).

monstrataque reddere verba tam facilis: For *monstrata*, see II 5, 1n., for *reddere* 7-8n. here.

facilis: followed by the inf., 'prone', 'ready' (*OLD* 8a), occurs also at I 1, 26, I 6, 67, III 1, 14, *Th.* I 607, V 44, VIII 217, IX 396, XII 397. The inf. follows it since Prop. (II 11, 12 active inf., IV 8, 40 passive inf.), see II 1, 166-8n., *TLL* VI[1] 60, 50 ff. and 64, 30 ff.

quo...recluso: 'When he was set free'. Markl. wittily remarks: '*cavea quidem recluditur, sed non Psittacus, nisi cultro chirurgico*', and *recludere* generally means *aperire* in St. (see Dilke on *Ach.* I 498) and elsewhere, but *cf.* Verg. *A.* I 358-9 *veteres tellure thesauros/recludit*, IV 646 *ensem recludit*, and the absolute use of *recludere* 'to open up' in Pl. *Mos.* 452 and 937.

St. is also the first one to give the word the meaning 'to shut', *claudere, occludere*: III 4, 98 *speculum reclusit imagine rapta.* After him this meaning is found in the *Dig.*, *Vulg.*, christian authors, Porph., Pallad. *etc.*: Schamberger 322-3 (who is, I think, wrong to take III 1, 8 in the same sense *reclusi liminis...custos*). So, in view of Sts.' independent treatment of *recludere*, the somewhat rare meaning 'to set free' (see *OLD* 4) is tolerable here.

Melior dilecte: *Dilectus* (*dilectae*: M, *sodali*: Saenger ('?')) is not a word St. often employs for his friends, but see III 1, 88-9 *dilecta...Polli corda*, IV *Praef.* 17-20 *Maximum Vibium...a nobis diligi satis eram testatus.* It is also said of Glaucias (II 1, 37).

Note that the song of the birds is not addressed to the parrot, but to its owner, see 22-3n., II 1, 72-105n., 128-35n.

eras: This is the first and only time that St. employs a form of *esse* in this poem. Ov. has 12 instances of *esse* in *Am.* II 6, the first one in 8. For Sts.' avoidance of common words, see II 1, 87-8n., 101-2n.

33-4. At: *Ac*: M, *at*: m and other mss., printed by all editors. The adversative particle is almost never absent at the beginning of the *consolatio* proper: see V 3, 277, *tamen* II 1, 154 (n.), II 5, 24 (n.), III 3, 195, Ov. *Am.* III 9, 59, *cf.* Prop. III 18, 21, Ov. *Am.* II 6, 47, *Eleg. Maec.* II 11, *sed* II 6, 93, Hor. *Carm.* I 24, 19, *quin* II 1, 208, see E.-F. 118 n. 3, 124-5.

In II 6, 85 ff. St. follows the same scheme: adversative particle, litotes (*non inglorius/nec servilis*), luxury, final *pointe.*

umbris mittitur: See II 3, 72-4n. The present tense, also in *adolentur, respirant*, is used because the birds must sing this song at the funeral, *cf.* 22-3n.

34-6.: For the spices at the cremation, see II 1, 159-62n.

Assyrio..amomo: *Amomum* is 'cardamom', amomum cardamomum. It is often mentioned in poetry as a perfume or an unguent for the dead

or the ashes: Verg. *Ecl.* 3, 89, *Ciris* 512, Ov. *Tr.* III 3, 69, *Pont.* I 9, 52, Pers. 3, 104, Luc. X 168, Sil. XI 402, XV 117, Juv. 4, 108. Pl. *Truc.* 540 is often mentioned as the first occurrence of the word, but that is a conjecture (see Enk's critical apparatus), see *TLL* I 64 ff., André 1956 *s.v.*, *RE* I 1873-4. Plin. *Nat.* XII 48-9 describes it.

St. mentions it also in II 6, 88 *Assyrium gramen*, III 3, 112 *Assyrii liquores, Th.* VI 209 *Assyrii suci*, outside the cremation at I 2, 111, III 3, 132, III 4, 82.

Assyrius is very frequently added to *amomum*, e.g. Verg. *Ecl.* 4, 25, Mart. VIII 77, 3. *Amomum* may also be included in other mentions of *Assyrii odores*, like Catul. 68, 144, Tib. I 3, 7. The word itself may be Arabic.

Here *Assyrius* means simply 'oriental'. The spice came from India, Armenia and Media (Plin. *Nat.* XII 48-9). *Assyrius* is frequently used by poets as a synonym for oriental, see e.g. *Th.* II 91 with Mulder's note, Fortgens on *Th.* VI 209, Lunderstedt 18, Smith on Tib. I 3, 7, Kroll 1924, 294, *TLL* II 941, 45 ff. Catul. (68, 144) is the first to use the word in this way.

cineres: For the poetic plur., see II 1, 54-5n. Maas (525) is proved wrong here in his contention that in the nominative the plur. is never used for the sing., also in III 3, 37.

adolentur: *Adolere* is a word imported from religious ritual. It has two meanings: 'to increase' (by piling up offerings), (*numen*) *augere*, see Serv. on Verg. *A.* VI 704 *adolere proprio est augere*, Non. 81. 18 (L.) *numen auctius facere.* Its other meaning is '(ritual) burning': Non. 247 *adolere est urere.*

For the first meaning, *cf.* e.g. Lucr. IV 1237 *adolentque altaria donis*, Verg. *A.* I 704 *flammis adolere penates* (Servius: *colere*), Tac. *Hist.* II 3, *Ann.* XIV 30 *cruore captivo adolere aras, TLL* I 793, 23 ff., esp. 794, 4-5, Austin on *A.* I 704. For the second meaning, see Verg. *Ecl.* 8, 65 *verbenas... adole...et...tura, A.* III 547, Ov. *Met.* I 492 *stipulae...adolentur*, Col. XII 31 *corpus bestiolae adoletur* (both without religious implications), Tac. *Ann.* VI 28 (it is said of the phoenix) *patrium corpus in...solis aram perferre atque adolere, TLL loc. cit.* esp. 794, 8 ff.

The meaning 'to burn' seems to be preferable: The parallels, esp. Tac. *Ann.* VI 28, suggest 'to burn': the phoenix is referred to in 37. Moreover, for 'increasing' a place, rather than a person, seems to be the usual object.

cineres is somewhat difficult, whatever explanation is given: Fortgens on *Th.* VI 73 *munera...in cineres...feruntur* (before the pyre is burning) explains *cinis* as a metonymy for pyre. Vollm. takes *cineres* here proleptic. This amounts to the same thing as explaining it with *OLD* (4a) as 'ashes as the condition of the body after death, whether cremated or not'. I ac-

cept this explanation and think that *cineres adolentur amomo* means 'the body is burnt (together) with *amomum*'.

Translators unanimously render 'his ashes are rich with' (Mozl., similarly Clouard, Fr., Sb., Traglia-Ar.). This is impossible: this meaning of *adolere* is non-existent; it just occurs a few times as 'to smell' in late authors (*TLL* I 794, 31-4). Moreover, that would imply that after the cremation unguents are poured out over the ashes. This is inconsistent with *plumae* and with the present tenses in both *adolentur* and *respirant.* And this custom is not known, see E.-F. 144 § 44, where only wine at the *ossilegium* is mentioned (*cf.* II 6, 90-1).

tenues...plumae: See *Th.* V 597 *tenuia ossa,* VI 196 *tenuia ora* (both about Opheltes). *Tenuis* adds a pathetic touch, contrasting the small parrot still more with the great world (24-37n.), and emphasizes Melior's generosity, see *Th.* VI 71 *parvi...augescunt funere manes* and II 1, 157-82n. Sauvage's complaint that *tenues 'n'a rien de très caractéristique'* assumes that St. would have done better to give an exact description of the parrot's plumage here.

Arabum respirant gramine: *Arabum gramen* is probably myrrh, see II 1, 159-62n., also for *gramen.*

respirant 'to be redolent with, to give forth a vapour' (*OLD* 3d) is not found elsewhere with abl. St. has it 7 times without a complement, meaning 'to recover one's breath', or 'to enjoy a respite'. In II 2, 78 *aera respirat* the sense is the same as here, but the construction is different. These two lines have no parallel (see *OLD* 3d).

Vollm. quotes Claud. *Phoen.* 96 *divino spirant altaria fumo,* to which may be added *Silv.* III 3, 24 *spirabunt floribus arae,* VFl. V 585 *spirat coma... aura,* VI 157, Luc. IX 678 *spirasse veneno ora reor* (of Medusa). This seems to protect the abl. here. Markl. conjectured *respirant gramina Sicaniosque crocos.* But *respirare* in this sense with an acc. has no better parallels.

Sicaniis...crocis: Saffron, see II 1, 159-62n.

36-7. senio nec fessus inerti scandet odoratos phoenix felicior ignes: 'And the phoenix, tired by slow old age, will not mount his fragrant pyre more happily'.

'*Dans la légende du phénix, la récolte des parfums occupe une place primordiale*': Hubaux-Leroye 68. This association exists since Herod. III 107 ff., in Latin in Ov. *Met.* XV 393-4, 398-400, Mela III 8, 82, Plin. *Nat.* X 4, XII 85 (at II 6, 87), Mart. V 7, VI 55, 1, IX 11, 4, X 17, 6, Lact. *Av. Phoen.* 60 ff., Claud. *Phoen.* 40 ff., Avien. *Descr. orbis terrae* 1128, Dracont. *De laud. Dei* I 326-8, Sid. *Carm.* 2, 412 ff., 22, 50-1, Ennod. *Carm.* I 9, 149 ff., see also at II 6, 87-8, Hubaux-Leroy 68-97, *RE* XX 416 ff.

St. seems the first one in Latin to mention explicitly the pyre of the phoenix: Lucan (VI 680) mentions *cinis Eoa positi phoenicis in ara*, and Pliny (*Nat.* XIX 29) also mentions the ashes, but the pyre occurs first in Solinus (XXXIII 12). Ovid, whom St. imitates here, merely says: *Met.* XV 394 ff. *turis lacrimis et suco vivit amomi* (see 34 here). */Haec ubi quinque suae complevit saecula vitae/.../unguibus et puro nidum sibi construit ore./Quo simul ac casias et nardi lenis aristas/quassaque cum fulva substravit cinnama murra,/se super imponit finitque in odoribus aevum.* But the fact that the theme of the combustion is well known from Egypt and the allusive manner of Ovid, the way in which Pliny speaks casually of the *cineres* suggest that the idea of a pyre was common before Solinus, *cf.* Hubaux-Leroy 144-5, 154.

In the *Silv.* St. seems to disregard the more common tradition, *viz.* that the phoenix transports the ashes of its dead predecessor, from which it is born, to Egypt, to burn them (not itself) there (again); so Herod., Ov., Mela, Tac., Ach. Tat., Lact., Claud., *cf.* Hubaux-Leroy 162 ff. For from III 2, 114 *quae sibi praesternat vivax altaria Phoenix* (in Egypt: vss 101 ff.) we should rather infer that he follows an other tradition, represented in Artemidorus (*Oneirocrit.* IV 47), Philostratus (*Apoll.* III 49) and Achilles Tatius (*Leuc. et Clit.* III 24), that the bird itself, when old, arrives in Egypt to die, *cf.* Hubaux-Leroy 29, 160-2, also for the influence of the Egyptian *bennu* on the concept of the phoenix. Though the phoenix as a species is immortal, individual phoenixes become old and tired, see Lact. Placidus at Ov. *Met.* XV 394 ff. *Phoenix...cum est senectute pressa*, schol. Luc. VI 680, Claud. *Phoen.* 27 ff., Lact. *Ave Phoen.* 60, Hubaux-Leroy 140.

St. has taken the *vivax Phoenix, unica semper avis* which Corinna's parrot meets in Elysium (*Am.* II 6, 54, see *vivax* in *Silv.* III 2, 114 above) and combined it with some allusions to *Met.* XV (*cf.* esp. Colton 77) into an extremely happy and apt conclusion of the poem: the pyre of the phoenix and its persistent association with unguents, also at the combustion, fit in very well with the actual cremation of the parrot and the usual spices. Moreover, the suggestion is given that the parrot is not maimed by old age. This is a consolatory *topos* (*cf.* II 1, 153-7n., *Th.* XII 338-9, *CE* 1522, 13, E.-F. 153 § 75), which makes the parrot even surpass the phoenix (*nec felicior*). But it is only an allusion, for St. does *not* say that the parrot is *nec fessus senio*, as Mozl. and E.-F. explain (see below). And the suggestion is also given that the parrot is immortal, or will come to life again. This is perhaps an allusion to the idea that the dead will be replaced (see II 1, 226-34n.), but it is also an emulation of Ovid's Elysium, already alluded to in 8.

Nec goes with *felicior* (or *scandet*), for *nec fessus* would force us to interpret like Mozl.: 'He will mount a fragrant pyre, a happier phoenix, free from the weary languor of old age'. This disagrees with *scandet*, which is typical for the phoenix which burns itself.

For the comparison, see II 1, 8-12n. For the position of *sed*, see II 1, 78-81n., II 6, 91-2n.

senio inerti: see V 3, 258 *segnis labe senili, Th.* III 384-5, VI 559, Verg. *A.* XI 85, Ov. *Met.* VIII 712.

ignis: *rogus*, see Ter. *And.* 129 *in ignem imposita est*, Ov. *Met.* XIII 583 *impositos supremis ignibus artus, TLL* VII 292, 66 '*interdum fere i.q. rogus, pyra*', e.g. Man. IV 54 *ut corpus sepeliret naufragus ignis/eiectaeque rogum facerent fragmenta carinae*, Luc. VIII 737.

II. 5. LEO MANSUETUS

Animals in circus and theatre:
F. Drexel, *Die Tierhetzen.* In: *SG*[10] II 77-92.
G. Jennison, *Animals for Show and Pleasure in Ancient Rome.* Manchester 1937.
J. M. C. Toynbee, *Animals in Roman Life and Art.* London 1973.

Circus-poems:
O. Weinreich, *Studien zu Martial.* Stuttgart 1928.

II 5:
H. Cancik, *Amphitheater. Zum Problem der 'Gesamtinterpretation' am Beispiel von Statius, Silve II 5: Leo Mansuetus.* AU 14 (1971), 66-81.
D. M. Nisard, *Poètes latins de la décadence I.* Paris 1849², 309-16 (part of a curious essay on St.: Nisard paints a detailed and completely fictional scene, with St. reading this poem at a public lecture which is attended by Domitian).

Funerary poetry:
See II 1 *Intr.*

Epigram:
See II 3 *Intr.*

Poems on dead animals:
See II 4 *Intr.*

I. This poem on the death of a tame lion in the arena resembles the preceding poem in many respects: both poems stand within the literary traditions of the poem on a dead animal and the *consolatio*, see II 4 *Intr.* They emphasize the contrast between Nature and Culture (see below). They are among the shortest poems which St. left us. St. himself connects them in his preface: *eandem...stili facilitatem* (II *Praef.* 17, see II 3 *Intr.*).

Yet there are distinct differences between the two, which confer its own character on II 5: this poem is not a parody, that is to say that no other poems on a dead lion, or the death of an animal in the arena are known before St. (see II 4 *Intr.* for a definition of parody). Mart. VIII 53 (on a dead lion) and IX 69 (a dog killed in the arena) stand nearest to *Silv.* II 5. In his poem on Melior's parrot St. makes some gentle fun (II 4 *Intr.*, II 4, 14-5n.). But here every trace of humour is absent. This is probably connected with the addressee: here, as in II 4, the animal itself is addressed (*cf.* 24-7n.); but the poem is meant for Domitian himself, *cf.* 27 *magni...Caesaris* and II *Praef.* 17-9 *leo mansuetus, quem in amphitheatro prostratum frigidum erat sacratissimo Imperatori ni statim traderem.* This situation does not call for making fun[1].

[1] On the other hand it is not clear why Fr. says (78 n. 1): '(*Stace*) *commandé sans doute*'.

Herrlinger classifies II 5 as one of the (very rare) Latin specimens of '*ernst-sentimentale*' poems on dead animals. This is justifiable: it is neither parodistic nor pointed: death and life or man and beast are not sententiously juxtaposed and the poem has no final point (see II 4 *Intr.*) or wit. This distinguishes it from the epigrams by Antipater and Antiphilus (e.g. *AP* IX 222, see Herrlinger 97 ff., also Newmyer 72-3). Mart. VIII 53 is more sententious and closes with a semi-mythological pointed compliment. Mart. IX 69 is much more like an epitaph: the dog itself is speaking and mentions its good points, its age and way of death, and ends on a note of comfort.

E.-F. (118) refuses to classify II 5 as a *consolatio*, because it is *quasi epigrammatis loco scriptum* (II *Praef.* 16-7). As we have seen (II 3 *Intr.*, see also below), it is misleading to call II 3 or 4 or 5 epigrams. The basic situation of the poem is that of the *consolatio*: someone is dead, someone is to be comforted and someone comforts. The poem is characterized by the essential tension which leads from grief to solace: *quid...profuit* (1), *occidis* (7)/*magna solacia* (24), see II 1 *Intr.*, E.-F. 121. Comfort is very rare in the epigram on a dead animal: Herrlinger (67 ff.) quotes only Archias *AP* VII 213, 7-8.

In II 5 the essential *topoi* of the *consolatio* are present, in their normal order, but in mixed form: *laudatio, lamentatio, descriptio mortis, consolatio.* The poem has no Introduction, but opens with mixed *laudatio* and *lamentatio* (1-7). Then follows a *lamentatio* (8-15), where elements of the *descriptio mortis* figure (8-11). The *descriptio mortis* (16-23) functions also as a *laudatio* (17 *animi, virtus*, 22 *piger*). The *consolatio* proper, as always, ends the poem (24-30). It includes elements from the *descriptio funeris.* See for the whole II 1 Intr.[2]. St. does something like he did in II 4: he writes a kind of *consolatio*, but a less important one than those for human beings. He makes this clear by his short treatment and somewhat less formal distinctions. But the purpose of II 5 differs slightly from that of II 4: not only does St. strike a far more serious tone (*cf.* Herrlinger 87, Newmyer 72), but he keeps the normal order of the *topoi* (see II 4 *Intr.*). For topics belonging to the *consolatio* as a *genre* in this poem, see 1n., 7n., 11-3n., 14-5n., 16-7n., 24-7n., 30n.

II. Animals in circus and (amphi)theatre were a subject for the epigram (see Vollm. p. 25, II 3 *Intr.*), and Martial has many poems on animals,

[2] E.-F. also points out (118 n. 3) resemblances between Sts.' other funerary poems and II 5, and so does Cancik 1971, 77-8. Newmyer argues (72-4) that II 5 is a typical *consolatio.* This is exaggerated: the absence of an introduction with an exhortation to mourn and the blending of the principal *topoi* is against this. His division into *exordium* = *laudatio* (1-6), *lamentatio* (7-23), *consolatio* (24-30) is false, esp. where 16 ff. are concerned. Nevertheless, in a general way I agree with his estimate of II 5 as a *consolatio.*

esp. in the *liber spectaculorum.* One of his favourite themes is that of the tame lion playing with hares, see 3-6n. Nearly all of those poems turn upon a curious or unexpected feature, which Mart. expresses succinctly and with point: a sow giving birth while she is dying in the arena (*Sp.* 12, 13, 14), a tame tiger which has turned wild (*ibid.* 18), a deer which begs and receives mercy from Caesar (*ibid.* 30, *cf.* 17), *etc.*

II 5 is not pointed in this sense. But St. employs a central paradox (*cf.* II 1 *Intr.*) which also often underlies Martial's poems: the contrast nature/culture or animal/man. This is a common trait of II 2, II 3, II 4 and II 5: Pollius Felix taming and subjecting nature in II 2 (II 2 *Intr.*, 52 ff.n.), the 'unnatural' tree of II 3 in its ideal landscape (*Intr.*), the speaking birds of II 4 (*Intr.*, 29 ff.n.), see Cancik 1965, 20 and 1971, 78. In this poem the lion represents nature at it most savage, the king of animals, tamed by man.

The lion stands for power, majesty and generosity, but also for rage and bloodthirstiness in ancient literature and science, see Kytzler 1962 (on Sts.' comparisons in the epics), *RE* XIII 977 ff., Otto 1890 nos. 932-8, Drerauer 8 ff., 12 ff., 67 n. 9, 178. Here it is a trained performer (1-6), which has unlearnt its most characteristic property, *ira* (1n.). In spite of this, man has forced the animal to play two different parts, that of the hunting animal in a *venatio* (see below) and that of a circus-performer. In both respects it is what man has trained it to be; the lion is both clown and gladiator. That it is pseudo-human in both respects is emphasized by the comparisons to a Roman soldier (19-23) and to a gladiator (26); note also *vir-tus* (17), not *ira*[3]. See also 7-11n.

III. It remains a difficult problem for us how to fit what we consider as its excessive cruelty into our view of Roman society. In the context of this poem this raises the question how 'a people that was so much alive to the interest and beauty of the animal kingdom...should yet have taken pleasure in the often hideous sufferings and agonizing deaths of quantities of magnificent and noble creatures' (Toynbee 21, who can not solve the problem, *cf.* note 3).

Wild animals offered public entertainment in Rome in the following ways: they were exhibited in zoos, amphitheatres and the *Circus*, often performing special tricks. They fought against beasts of the same kind, of different kinds, or against men, whether criminals or professional

[3] For the combination of the trained and the fighting animal and the lust for power which is at the base of these Roman entertainments, see Cancik 1971, esp. his thoughtful remarks 78-81. The only respect in which I can not agree with him is that I do not think that 16 ff. represent a reversal to the lion's natural state of being, with all its implications.

armed fighters. They were also hunted rather than fought, in the so-called *venationes*, by *venatores*, professional hunters. This last custom may be the origin of the 'games'. A combination of any of these amusements was possible. See *SG* II[10] 77-92, Jennison 42 ff., Toynbee 17-21, 46-9, 95-7, 108, 184, 205, Cancik 1971, 78-81.

Lions are among the most often mentioned animals. The first *venatio* with lions in Rome was seen in 186 B.C., in the games which Fulvius Nobilior celebrated (Liv. XXXIX 22, 2, *cf.* Jennison 47, *SG* II[10] 77, Toynbee 61-2). Thereafter the *venationes* with lions became more frequent and on an ever greater scale, culminating in the games which Augustus organised in 29 B.C. and 11 B.C. (Suet. *Aug.* 43, 1, Plin. *Nat.* VIII 64, Dio LI 22, 5, Jennison 42-64, Toynbee 18, 62). They continued under Caligula, Claudius and Titus, who celebrated the opening of the Colosseum by killing 9,000 animals (Jennison 60-75).

The first tamed and trained lions were shown by Mark Antony, who appeared in public in a chariot drawn by lions (Plin. *Nat.* VIII 55, Plut. *Ant.* 9, Jennison 56, Toynbee 63-4, Weinreich 1928, 102). Elegabalus later picked up this hint at divinity[4], doing the same thing (SHA *Elegab.* 28). Of other tricks the one with the lions and the hares is the best-known one, see 3-6n.

Some people kept a tame lion at home: Sen *Dial.* IV 31, 5, Juv. 7, 75-7, Epict. IV 1, 25. Caracalla had a large number of lions around him, amongst which one was his favourite, and Elegabalus amused himself by frightening his guests by the appearance of lions at dinner or when the guests were asleep: Dio LXXVIII 7, 2, SHA *Elegab.* 21 and 25, Toynbee 64. The custom of keeping lions was taken over from oriental despots, like Queen Berenice or Hanno (Ael. *NA* V 39, Tert. *An.* 24). '*Löwen und Herrscher, das gehört zusammen, auch für die Cäsaren Roms*': Weinreich 1928, 102. This is why Mussolini also kept lions.

For lions as public executors, which they became more frequently in the Empire, see Jennison 63.

IV. The lion of this poem was exhibited in the amphitheatre. Its death must have been unexpected in the sense that this was not planned; but the possibility must have been taken into acount. The animal probably figured in an act combining tricks and training with a *venatio*, see Cancik 1971, 79 and under **II.** above.

The poem can not be dated with any certainty. Domitian organised games in 89 for his triumph over the Dacians and the Chatti, possibly

---

[4] See e.g. Verg. *A.* III 111-3, VI 784-5 with Austin and Norden, X 156-7, Ov. *Fast.* IV 415-8 and Bömer, M. J. Vermaseren, *Cybele and Attis. The Myth and the Cult* (London 1977), 14-5, 18, 43, 84.

alluded to in Mart. V 65, and in 93 after his return from Sarmatia (Mart. VIII 26), see Jennison 75-9. But St. would almost certainly have mentioned the fact if the lion was killed during one of those games. It would be very much of a coincidence if the context of this poem were known from other sources. Mart. mentions one other lion which was killed (VIII 53). But Domitian often gave big *venationes*: Suet. *Dom.* 4, 1 *spectacula assidue magnifica et sumptuose edidit...venationes*, 4, 5, *cf.* 19 *centenas varii generis feras saepe in Albano secessu conficientem spectavere*[5]. The reason why St. has left out concrete details (see at *fugiente fera* 11) may be that he composed the poem on the spur of the moment; but if he had thought them important to (understanding) the poem, he would have excluded the poem from his book, or added details before publication.

1-6.: *Laudatio* mixed with *lamentatio.* Formally these lines are divided into 1 + 2 + 3 lines by *quid profuit...quid...quid.* This division emphasizes the aspect of *lamentatio*, for the pathetic question *quid profuit, quid iuvat* occurs frequently in the *lamentatio*, e.g. V 1, 154-5, Ov. *Am.* II 6, 17-20, III 9, 21, Prop. IV 11, 11-2, *cf.* III 18, 11-6, also in other kinds of poetry, see E.-F. 137 § 28 B, Nisbet-H. on Hor. *Carm.* I 28, 4 and 1n. below. Besides the parallelism of the three *quid* at the beginning of the line, there is the changing construction: *quid* is followed by an intransitive verb, a transitive one, and by *quod...suetus* (*es*).

As to content, line 7 properly belongs to the *lamentatio*: *occidis/-dit* or *iaces/-et* usually follow upon the formula *quid profuit.*

The aspect of *laudatio* is rather treated in 3 + 3 lines: 1-3 are general, 4-6 refer to the tricks which the beast has learned. The key-word *mansuescere* is in the first line, and this is somewhat specified in 2-3, which treat of unlearning natural faults and learning 'unnatural' virtues. *Docte* in 7 also belongs to this *laudatio.*

1. Quid: For the question opening the poem, see II 1, 1-3n., and for the question in the *lamentatio*, to add pathos, see II 1 *Intr.*, II 4, 1-3n., E.-F. 137-8 §§ 27-9.

tibi: For the address, see II 1, 1-3n., 52-4n. Apart from the title (II 1 *titulus* note), the word 'lion' is not mentioned until 13, and for the animal itself it is only employed as the last word of the poem (note there), though it is, of course, clear what the subject of the poem is within a few lines.

monstrata...ira: This is difficult. *Ira* is the natural characteristic of lions, see Heinze on Lucr. III 294. It is the common factor in almost all

[5] Suetonius says (*Dom.* 9, 1) that Domitian in the beginning of his reign shrank from bloodshed and therefore was against offering oxen. Either he changed in the course of time (as Suet. thinks), or he had a different reason for sparing oxen.

Sts.' comparisons with lions in the Thebaid and the Achilleid, see e.g. *Th.* VII 529, VIII 123, XII 357, 740 and Kytzler 1962, esp. 150 and 153. This implies that the phrase *monstrata mansuescere...ira* may mean 'to be tamed after/though (Nature) had shown you (your instinctive) rage'.

There is evidence for the idea that Nature 'shows' the instincts to animals and men: Lucr. contends that Nature taught man to utter sounds (V 1028 ff.); and he compares this to the calf which *iratus petit* before its horns are fully grown to butt with, and to *catuli pantherarum scymnique leonum* who already bite and claw before their teeth and claws are well formed (1036-8). Hor. *S.* II 1, 51-2 says the same: *dente lupus cornu taurus petit; unde nisi intus monstratum* (*TLL* VIII 1442, 61-3 connects this with our vs.). See also Ov. *Hal.* 1-6, imitating Lucr. V 1028 ff., *admonuit* (*natura* or *deus*)...*sui: vitulus sic namque minatur qui nondum gerit in tenera iam cornua fronte; sic dammae fugiunt, pugnant virtute leones.* For *monstrare,* see also *CE* 937, 1 (a graffito from Pompei) *scribenti mi dictat Amor monstratque Cupido.* For the notion of natural behaviour which is taught, or rather shown, by older animals, parents or Nature, see Schrijvers 1974, 350-4, 359-64[6]. This is the interpretation of most editors: Vollm., Fr., Sb., perhaps Traglia-Ar., Cancik 1971.

Some critics have argued that this is too difficult (Karsten 353, Ziehen 1904, 651). Though this may be untrue in itself, an objection is possible: St. generally employs *monstrare* in rather the opposite sense, for teaching or showing cultural, non-instinctive behaviour: I 4, 108, I 5, 31-2, II 1, 123 (*artes* in both cases), II 4, 31, II 6, 103-4, IV 8, 58-9, V 2, 128, V 3, 6-7, 180-1, 235-7, 289-90, V 5, 81-2, *Th.* IV 807, VI 122-3, VI 833, *Ach.* I 118, 573, *cf.* Vollm. on III 3, 39. It is true that *monstrare* frequently refers to showing rather than to formal teaching (e.g. II 4, 31, II 6, 103-4, V 5, 81-2), but it is not instinctive or natural behaviour which is shown.

On the other hand, conjectures fail to convince: *constrata* (: Q) is printed by Clouard, after the *ed. Bipontina.* This would make sense, but *consternere* with an abstract object does not occur in Latin, see *TLL* IV 509, 16-24, Postgate 1905, 123[7]. Postgate (*loc. cit.*) proposes *nunc strata,* which is printed by Mozl. But *sternere* with an abstract object seems not much less rare than *consternere.* Forcellini gives a few instances, with only one remotely similar case, Verg. *G.* I 330 *mortalia corda stravit pavor* (Forc. IV 484, *col.* 1-2).

---

[6] Dierauer (198 n. 21, 212 ff.) distinguishes sharply between instinct and learning by imitation. He ascribes the thesis of instinctive behaviour of animals exclusively to Stoic doctrine (which has intruded into Lucr.). Both points seem to be well made; but they have no direct bearing on the explanation of *monstrata* here.

[7] Though *consternere* does not occur in St., the Concordance quotes *Th.* VII 130 for it, where *consternat* is from *consternare* (a lemma which is not included in the Concordance).

So we must retain the text. There is one other interpretation of *monstrata ira*, given by Jennison (79 n. 1) and apparently by Saenger (*app.*), that the lion's trainers instructed it to show *ira*, see *Ach.* I 858-60 *leo...edidicit nullasque rapi nisi iussus in iras*, Dio LX 13, 4 λέοντα διδαγμένον ἀνθρώπους ἐσθίειν. But *ira* is a typically instinctive trait of the lion, and *edidicit* in *Ach.* I seems to refer to 'formal teaching', see on 7. Moreover, this explanation of *monstrata* is not easily combined with *mansuescere*.

The easiest way to explain *monstrata ira*, however, is to take it very generally: the (natural) anger which you used to display (before you were captured and tamed). That is to say: 'what good has it brought to you to become tame, after you had once displayed your anger'. This may be the interpretation of Traglia-Aricò: '*dopo aver dato prova della tua nativa ferocia*'. It seems the most attractive solution for this rather elliptic expression.

Monstrata mansuescere...ira is equal to *humanas dediscere caedes* (2) in this interpretation.

2-3. scelus humanasque...caedes: *Que* is epexegetical, see *Th.* VII 365 *scelera et caedis*, XI 153 *scelus et caedem.*

humanas here is used like a genitive *hominis*, which we would label 'objective', *cf.* Sen. *Con.* X 5, 8 *internecione humana*, Apul. *Met.* I 19 *conscius mihi caedis humanae*, Paul. Fest. 117. This use is first found in Catul. 64, 20 *humanos...hymenaeos*, marriage to a mortal being, see *TLL* VI[3] 3086, 56-83.

imperiumque pati et domino parere minori: The animal's enslavement by man is sententiously expressed (see also *claustra* 4): *parere* and *minori* juxtaposed, to obey though the master is inferior. For *minor*, see I 2, 15, II 6, 35, III 3, 198, *OLD* 7. All the other words of the line refer to subjection; note *domino* instead of the usual *magister* (3-6n.).

In *Ach.* I 858 ff. St. describes what happens when a tame lion is goaded into a fury: *leo...cum...mores accepit pectique iubas hominemque vereri edidicit nullasque rapi nisi iussus in iras, si semel adverso radiavit lumine ferrum, eiurata fides domitorque inimicus...timidoque pudet servisse magistro.* See also Luc. IV 237-42 *sic ubi desuetae silvis in carcere clauso mansuevere ferae et voltus posuere minaces atque hominem didicere pati, si...venit in ora cruor, redeunt rabiesque furorque...fervet et a trepido vix abstinet ira magistro.* See also Lucr. V 1310-22 about the unsuccessful use of tame lions in war.

Imperium may already point forward to the comparison of the lion to a soldier. But it is also used for commanding animals: Liv. XXVII 14, 10 *insidentis magistri imperio* (an elephant), Verg. *A.* VII 487 (Silvia's deer).

3-6.: Three tricks are described: **1)** the beast returns of its own accord to its cage; **2)** it catches its prey and lets it go again without being told to; **3)** it allows the trainer to put his hand into its jaws and withdraw it.

Training of animals for the games was intensively practised and the skill of the trainers was great under the Empire, see Plut. *Soll. An.* 5. The most amazing performances were given by elephants: to make them throw weapons and dance was merely *vulgare* (Plin. *Nat.* VIII 5, *cf.* Ael. *NA* II 11, Mart. I 104). They also did rope-walking (Plin. *Nat.* VIII 5-6, Suet. *Gal.* 6, 1), they dined and wrote Greek and Latin (Plin. *loc. cit.*, Ael. *loc. cit.*, Toynbee 46-9, Jennison 63, 65, 78, *SG* II^{10} 86-7). But other animals also exhibited their tricks: bears (Toynbee 95-7), dogs (one consummate actor: Plut. *Soll. An.* 19, Toynbee 108), horses (Toynbee 184), seals (*ibid.* 205), bulls (Plin. *Nat.* VIII 182, Ael. *NA* VII 4, Mart. V 31, Jennison 71, *SG* II^{10} 86-7).

Manilius mentions trainer of animals as a profession for which one's horoscope makes one fit or not (IV 234 ff., V 700 ff.) and Mart. refers to trainers, e.g. *Sp.* 10, 1, XI 69. Sen *Ep.* 85, 41, like St., first mentions subjecting animals in general and then their tricks: *certi sunt domitores ferarum qui saevissima animalia et ad occursum expavescenda hominem pati* (see 3 here) *subigunt...(et) usque in contubernium mitigant: leonis faucibus magister manum insertat* (6 here), *osculatur tigrim suus custos.*

St. has ordered the tricks according to the danger involved: one with lifeless objects, one with animals, one with man.

Quid, quod: *Quid (profuit), quod.* The inf. following *prodesse* is usual since classical Latin (*mansuescere*): *LHSz.* 348. Elsewhere in St. (4 times[8]) it is always construed with a dative or absolutely. For *prodest quod LHSz.* quotes one instance (Cic. *Flac.* 101) and K.-St. none. It occurs also at Verg. *Ecl.* 3, 74, Ov. *Met.* XIII 135, 137, *Ep.* 17, 173, *Tr.* III 2, 5, Luc. VI 304, VIII 865, not in Hor., VFl., Sil. See also *TLL* IX^2 266, 32-50 *obest quod* (only examples from prose).

abire...rursusque reverti: The detail is not known for lions, but *cf.* Silvia's deer *ipse domum sera quamvis se nocte ferebat* (Verg. *A.* VII 492). Goats and sheep returning home of their own accord are a common feature of descriptions of the Golden Age, e.g. Verg. *Ecl.* 4, 21, Hor. *Epod.* 16, 49-50, Tib. I 3, 45-6.

Many animals must have left the arena alive. They were usually driven back to their cages by armed men (with spears and whips); when they had been driven out of the arena they were returned to their cages by the beast-master and his attendants, see Jennison 177-9, who convincingly reconstructs the scene from the scanty evidence.

domo...claustra: St. calls the cage both a home and a prison, like the cage of Melior's parrot (II 4, 11 and 14-5). *Claustra* makes the return of

---

[8] The Concordance has omitted II 5, 1 under *prosum.*

the lion still more unexpected and emphasizes the unnatural behaviour of the tamed animal. This is also true for *sponte* and *laxo* (n.).

For *claustra* in the sense 'prison', see e.g. Verg. *A.* II 259, Hor. *Carm.* III 11, 44, *OLD* 2a. The word does not occur elsewhere in the *Silvae.*

a capta iam...recedere praeda: 'To withdraw from an already captured prey'. St. probably alludes to a trick which is often mentioned by Martial, lions playing with hares: Mart. I 6, 14, 22, 44 (where Mart. defends himself against the charge that this subject appears too often), 48, 51, 60, 104. For an analysis of these poems, see Weinreich 90 ff. The contrast big/small offers ample opportunity for point to Mart., and comparisons of Domitian to the lion and the hares to his opponents are also frequent.

The hares ran around in the lion's mouth: Mart. I 6, 4 *ingenti ludit in ore*, 14, 3 *prensus blando totiens a dente rediret et per aperta vagus curreret ore lepus*, 48, 1-2 *rictibus...per quos itque reditque lepus*, 104, 15-8 *mittunt* (*leones*) *repetunt amantque captos et securior est in ore praeda, laxos cui dare perviosque rictus gaudent.* The feat is not mentioned elsewhere, except for once in St., III 3, 73-5 *qui metuenda ferarum corda domant mersasque iubent iam sanguine tacto reddere ab ore manus et nulla vivere praeda.*

praeda is often said of these hares: Mart. I 6, 3; 14, 5; 22, 5; 48, 2; 51, 6; 104, 16 (above).

It seems that the producers of this trick made the lions kill bulls before staging them with the hares: Mart. I 48, 1 *rictibus his tauros non eripuere magistri*, 51, 3, perhaps 60, 3, 104, 19-20 *mollem frangere dum pudet rapinam, stratis cum modo venerint iuvencis.* See Jennison 78. A technical reason may have been that the lions otherwise might have eaten the hares. But a psychological reason is as important; this combination presented the two sides of man's mastery over the animal world, as is shown here: he can 'make animals act natural' and 'make animals act unnatural', see *Intr.* and *Silv.* III 3, 74 above.

iam belongs to *capta*, and can not be compared to II 4, 14 *querulae iam sponte fores.*

insertas...manus...dimittere: This trick was already popular in antiquity, see III 3, 73-4 above, Sen *Ep.* 85, 41 (at 3-6 beginning), Mart. II 75, 1-2 *solitus leo...insertam...pati blandus in ora manum.* In *Sp.* 10, 1-2 Mart. mentions a lion which bit its trainer's hand, see also *Sp.* 18, 1-2 *lambere securi dextram consueta magistri tigris*[9].

laxo...morsu: With loose jaw. *Morsus* is sometimes used by St. in a sense which tends more to the concrete 'muzzle, jaw(s)' than to the

---

[9] Vollm. refers for this trick to Lucil. 207B. He probably means 286 (M. = 277 Krenkel) *esurienti leoni ex ore exculpere praedam*, which is a proverb (to bell the cat), see Otto 1890 no. 935.

abstract 'bite, biting', *cf.* on *gradus* II 2, 44 and on *gressus* II 3, 11, Rothstein on Prop. III 16, 17 *morsus...hiantis*: '*das Abstraktum* morsus *ein Beiwort erhält, das im Wirklichkeit dem zum Biss geöffneten Munde zukommt*'.

OLD (1c) gives *Th.* V 169 as the only instance of '(pl., meton.) the teeth, jaws'. But see also *Th.* I 589 *morsu...cruento* = I 603, IX 13 *morsibus uncis. TLL* VIII 1509, 56-65 quotes *Th.* V 169 and late prose, e.g. Sol. 32, 22 *morsus* (*crocodili*) *conveniunt.* Petr. 136, 4 may also belong here: (*anser*) *non dubitavit crus meum serrato vexare morsu* (Müller-Ehlers: '*mit ihrer Schnabelsäge*'). St. emulates Pers. 3, 102 *laxis labris* and Mart. I 104, 17 *laxos rictus, cf.* Mart. II 48, 18 *laxat...labella.*

7. Occidis, altarum vastator docte ferarum: A pathetic line, reminding of epic. For *occidis*, see 1-6n., II 4, 24, Prop. III 11, 18 /*occidit*, Hor. *Carm.* I 28, 6 /*occidit*, Ov. *Am.* II 6, 1 /*occidit*, 20 *nempe iaces!*/, *Epic. Drusi* 40 /*occidit, AP* VII 438, 1 and 487, 1 /ὤλεο δή.

vastator is an epic word. It occurs only 4 times before St.: Verg. *A.* IX 772 *ferarum vastator Amycum*, Ov. *Met.* IX 192 *Arcadiae vastator aper* (see Bömer there), XI 395 *vastatorem...ferum*, Sen. *Ben.* I 13, 3. *Vastatrix* occurs first in Sen. *Ep.* 95, 19. St. has *vastator* also at IV 6, 41 *vastator Nemees* and *Ach.* II 32 *vastator Troiae.* After him it recurs in the *Itala.* See also Phaed. III 2, 13-4 *pecus trucidat, ipsos pastores necat, et cuncta vastans saevit irato impetu* (a panther).

altarum: 'tall'. For animals: *Th.* VII 755 *alto...equo*, Rab. *poet.* 3 *elephans altus.* We may think of bulls, if we want to specify, see on *praeda* (5) above and Mart. I 22, 3 *servantur magnis isti cervicibus ungues.* Grasberger's (420) *hirtarum* is useless.

docte: 'skilled'. The word refers to the lion's training for killing in the arena, as Ziehen (1904, 651) claimed against Vollm. *Docere* can be said of Nature, as Cic. *Mur.* 6 shows, *partes lenitatis...quas me natura ipsa docuit.* In II 4, 16 *doctae* refers to the birds which can speak, a combination of instinct and teaching (see Hus 228-9, 235-7). This is also true of *docte* here; but the stress is put on teaching: it is opposed to *dediscere* (2) and the logical complement to the lion's tricks is its training to hunt. In view of Sts.' use of *monstrare* (1n.), it is dangerous to draw too fine a distinction; but *docere* can refer to teaching on a higher level as opposed to *monstrare*, see Lucr. V 1106 *monstrabant...*1143 *docuere.*

8-11. non...non...aut...sed: This reminds of the catalogues of causes of death, see II 1, 213-8n. The lion has not died a 'natural' death, one by which man killed it, but a strange, 'unnatural' death, one brought about by another animal.

The repetition of *non* is not infrequent in *Silv.* II, see II 1, 139, 222-3, II 2, 123-4 (123-7n.), 153-4, II 4, 26-7. But the anaphora of it at the

beginning of the line does not occur elsewhere in the second book. It is emphatic, both because of the anaphora and because negation is emphatic in itself, see Kroll on Catul. 64, 39, Marouzeau 1935, 255-60. When St. enumerates what is *not* the case, he generally leaves out *sed*, see II 1, 222 ff., II 4, 26 ff., II 6, 25 ff. For the construction here, see II 7, 43-5 *non...nec... nec...sed.*

St. probably alludes to two ways of hunting lions: armed men with spears (*venabula*) surround them (*curva...indagine*), or they are caught in a pit (*foveae*). For the first method, see Aymard 404-6 (who quotes this passage and refers to a now lost mosaic); for representations, see also Toynbee 25. The pit generally had a pillar of earth, stone or wood in the middle, on the top of which a lamb was tied. Round its outer edge was built a wall or fence. The lion would leap this and fall into the hidden pit (*caeco...deceptus*), see Jennison 142-3, *RE* XIII 980, Oppian. *Cyn.* IV 86 ff., Aymard 445 ff.

The first method may be divided into hunting with nets (*indagine*) and with spears (*venabula*). For hunting with nets, see Firm. *Math.* VIII 9, 1, Oppian. *Cyn.* IV 112 ff., Jennison 144-5, Aymard 406, Toynbee 25-30, 65-6 (with many mosaics). But whether St. thought of nets or not, *aut* suggests that he predominantly thought of two different situations.

grege Massylo: A group of African hunters. Historically, the *Massyli* are a tribe in the north-west of Africa, near Cirta. But in poetry, esp. since Silius, *Massylus* has become a synonym for 'African', see *RE* XIV² 2166, *Onom.* II 227 *col.* 1. Its first occurrence is Verg. *A.* IV 132 (see Pease), and St. may have thought of that passage: 121 *indagine cingunt*, 131-2 *retia rara, plagae, lato venabula ferro, Massylique ruunt equites*, 159 (Ascanius hopes) *fulvum descendere monte leonem.* See for *Massyl(i)us* also e.g. *A.* IV 483, Luc. IV 683, Sil. II 298, Mart. IX 71, 1. In 5 of its 6 occurrences in St. it is connected with lions: *Th.* II 676, V 330, VIII 124, XI 27, see Vollm. For these ornamental geographical adjectives with names of animals in Vergil, see van Wees 101-5.

St. never employs *Africus* (or *Āfrĭcānus*), which for metrical reasons is also rare in other poets (but see Pease on Verg. *A.* IV 37), but always a metonymy: *Lybicus* (e.g. *Th.* II 722, *cf.* 28n. here), *Gaetulus* (*Th.* IX 739), *Cinyphius* (IV 3, 90), *Maurus* (*Th.* IX 182) *etc.*

Though lions also came to Rome from Syria and Asia Minor, Africa is their poetical home, see Jennison 53, Toynbee 61.

For *grex*, group, see *OLD* 2a; for the adj. with it e.g. *Th.* II 691, *Ach.* I 564, VFl. VIII 129 *Haemonio...grege*, Mart. IX 86, 3, XII 11, 4. See also *Th.* VII 673-4 *greges...venantum.*

curva...indagine clausus: *Indagine claudere, cingere*, to surround with a cordon, has for its object either a beast (*Ach.* I 459-60 *sic curva feras indago*

latentis claudit, Luc. IV 437, Sen. *Phaed.* 46-8), or a wood, hill *etc.* (e.g. Verg. *Ecl.* 6, 56, *A.* IV 121 with Pease, Ov. *Met.* VII 766). A combination of both is found at Luc. VI 41-2.

formidato supra venabula saltu incitus: When the lion tries to jump over the spears which threaten it. The situation is the one painted in Verg. *A.* IX 551-3 *ut fera, quae densa venantum saepta corona contra tela furit seseque haud nescia morti inicit et saltu supra venabula fertur*, after Hom. *Il.* XII 41 ff. See also *Th.* VIII 124-6 *ut leo, Massyli cum lux stetit obvia ferri, tunc iras tunc arma citat; si decidit hostis ire supra satis est.*

formidato: St. could not use *formīdŭlōsus*, but he could have used *formidabilis* (*Th.* IV 473, VIII 581, IX 544), see Schubert 18, Mulder on *Th.* II 33. Neither word is very popular in poetry: *formidatus* is once in Hor. (*Ep.* II 1, 256), 3 times in Ov. (*Am.* I 7, 62, *Met.* XV 475, *Pont.* I 3, 24), once in Sil. It is relatively frequent in St.: *Th.* II 33, IX 185, *Ach.* I 1, *Silv.* III 1, 30, 5 times more as a part. Its rarity is probably due to its spondaic character, see Mulder *loc. cit.*, also for its various positions in the line.

caeco foveae...hiatu: 'The hidden opening of a pit'. This is imitated by Prud. *Psych.* 269-71 *foveae...hunc eques...dolum...incidit et caecum subito patefecit hiatum.* For *hiatus*, see also Cassiod. *psalm.* 24, 14 *fovearum hiatus*, Veget. III 2 p. 68 l. 17 *fossarum hiatu.*

deceptus: See Pl. *Poen.* 187 (with word-play) *ita decipiemus fovea lenonem Lycum*, Firm. *Math.* VIII 9, 1 *feras...foveis decipiet, cf.* Man. V 186 *mendaces...foveas*, Claud. *Stil.* III 341 (*leones*) *non fossa fefellit.*

For the ending, *cf.* Prop. IV 8, 5 *caeco descensus hiatu.*

victus fugiente fera: 'Overcome while the other beast was fleeing'. This is the climax of the series: the lion was not only killed by another animal, *praeter naturam*, but by an animal that was already in flight. This paradoxical situation is what interests St., not the identity of the other animal. If he had thought that relevant to his poem, he would have elaborated the point for his published version of it, see *Intr.* under **IV.**

Imagination has run riot in attempts to identify the *fugiens fera*: early commentators thought of a tiger (Domitius, Poliziano, Barth, Markland), because Mart. *Sp.* 18, 1-3 tells of a (tame) tiger killing a (wild) lion. So the lion in question can not be identical with our lion, the more so since the *liber spect.* is from 80 A.D. Vollm. suggests a snake, pointing out himself that this is very improbable in view of *ictus* (but see Plin. *Nat.* VII 13 *serpentium ictus*). Saenger apparently thought of a leopard, for he prints *pardae stupuere* in 13 for *placidi tumuere* (see note there). According to Jennison (80) only three animals deserve consideration: a bear, a leopard, and another lion (which he thinks the case, very improbably in view of 13-5). Cancik, finally, (1971, 76) suggests an

antelope. If *fugiente* is meant to imply that the killing was accidental (a possibility which commentators do not consider), any hoofed animal, but also an elephant may be meant.

For *victus*, see also 25.

11-3. Stat..cavea et...portis...tumuere leones: Two *topoi* of the *lamentatio*: the empty house (II 1, 67-9n., II 4, 11-5n., V 1, 198 *viduos penates*) and the complaint of the survivors (below).

The cage of the dead lion is open (*cardine aperto*), like the parrot's cage in II 4, 14. It is contrasted with the other cages (*clausis...portis*). By the present tense *stat* (contrast *tumuere*), St. draws attention to the empty cage, adding pathos.

The other lions are enraged because of this *nefas*. This is also mentioned at II 1, 175 (*cf.* II 1, 20 *scelus* n.), Ov. *Am.* III 9, 41-4, see *Silv.* II 6, 3, a similar context with a different shade of meaning. Similar complaints against Envy, the gods *etc.* occur often, see II 1, 120-4n., II 6, 58-70n. Concerning the solidarity of lions Pliny claims that they do not fight each other (*Nat.* VII 5, *cf.* Hor. *Epod.* 7, 11, Juv. 15, 160), but this is a phantasy (*RE* XIII 969). St. suggests that lions react like human beings, see *Intr.*

Stat means not much more than *est.* But, as Smith says, '*esse* is colourless, *stare* gives the picture' (on Tib. I 1, 64), see Mulder on *Th.* II 35, Pease on Verg. *A.* IV 135.

Stat, like *stant, i, it*, and similar monosyllabic forms, tends to take the first place in the line or in its clause: of 56 occurrences of *stat* in St. 25 are at the beginning of the line (a.o. II 3, 1) and 16 more open a clause (II 1, 12, here). Of the 23 occurrences of *stant* the figures are 15 (II 3, 16) and 2 (II 7, 17). For Verg. this is 8 and 4 out of 19 (*stat*) and 12 and 7 out of 23 (*stant*). This means that the general picture in both authors is the same, though they differ in details: St. has *stat* in non-initial position 27% of its occurrences and *stant* 26%. Vergil has *stat* in non-initial position 36% and *stant* 16%. Note that Vergil prefers *stant* to *stat* and makes less use of both words than St. does. See Pease *loc. cit.* and on the phenomenon as a whole Pease on *A.* IV 130, with literature.

cardine aperto: *Cardo* = *ianua* is usual; but the idea of a hinge remains generally present, see constructions like *cardinem movere, impellere, vertere* (*TLL* III 443, 7 ff., which ranges this line there). Here and in *Th.* VIII 349 *multo laxantur cardine Thebae* St. abandons this notion, see also Man. V 76 (*equi*) *laxato fugerunt cardine claustra.*

Note the different words which St. employs for (door of) the cage: *domo, claustra* (4), *cardine* (11), *cavea, portas* (12).

clausas circum undique portas: This is in M and in all modern editions, except Clouard's. Yet it is probably wrong: *circum undique* has almost become one word and no example of this combination is found where *circum* has prepositional force, see *TLL* III 1114, 73 ff. Saenger quotes *Th.* VII 548-9 *te circum undique dextrae/nudabunt ensis*, where, however, *te* depends on *nudabunt.* The only meaning which *clausas circum...portas* could have if it existed is 'all round the closed gates'. Since the lions must be inside the closed cages, Vollm., Mozl., Fr., Sb., Traglia-Ar. translate 'behind their barriers all around'.

I accept the old conjecture *clausis...portis*, made before 1580 (see van Dam 396-7, also for other conjectures), in the sense 'behind their barriers all around', or 'after their doors had been closed all around'.

For the construction of the line, see *Th.* II 228 *virginibus circum undique fusae*, IV 432 *late iaculis circum undique fixis/*, V 1, 155, Lucr. III 403, Verg. *A.* III 634 *undique circum/fundimur.*

placidi tumuere leones: M has *timuere. Tumuere* is Baehrens' conjecture, accepted by all editors, except Clouard (Merrill 95 obelizes *timuere*): *tumere/tumescere* belongs with *ira* (II 1, 58-9, *Th.* VII 22-3, Cic. *Tusc.* III 19 *sapientis...animus...nunquam tumet; at iratus animus...*, Sen. *Phoen.* 352 *tumet animus ira, Tro.* 1093-6), see 1n. *Placidus* refers to the opposite thing, the lions' tameness: Sen. *Dial.* IV 31, 6 *intra domum...leonum...ora placida*, Plin. *Nat.* XVI 16 (*arbores*) *placidiores*, Mart. I 22, 1 *saeva...placidi...ora leonis.* The juxtaposition of these two elements fits very well into the context of the poem, see also *Th.* XI 378-9 *tumentem placavi.* As Kl. (*app.*) remarks: '*si postea cecidere iubae ante irati fuerunt*'[10].

Tumere followed by the inf. does not occur elsewhere. Heinsius very plausibly conjectured it at *Ach.* I 348 in a different sense ('is proud to') *tumet componere crines.* For other verbs of affect followed by acc. cum inf. (*irascor, fremo, furo, etc.*), see *LHSz.* 358.

Other conjectures are inferior to *tumuere*: *fremuere* (Heinsius); Markl. wrote *hoc licuisse nefas pavido gemuere leones*; Phill. prints his own *intumuere*, see *Th.* I 412 *irae intumuere*, which is a possibility. See also van Dam 396-7.

14-5. cecidere iubae, puduitque...aspicere: The lions were not only angry, they were ashamed. The *lamentatio* ends on this note, for the lion's death would be very sad indeed if there were no *res gestae*, only cowardice. After this mournful note St. can begin the *descriptio mortis* plus *laudatio* (see *Intr.*) by denying the charge: *puduit..../At non...pudor.*

The manes of the lion are sometimes mentioned as a sign of his vigour. They are erected when it lusts for blood, *cf.* Verg. *A.* X 726

[10] Baehrens spoilt his emendation by changing *placidi* into *rabidi.*

comas... arrexit, Ilias 502, Mulder on *Th.* II 677-8. Similarly divine fury often results in hair standing on end: *Th.* X 606, *Ach.* I 522, Verg. *A.* VI 48, Luc. V 154, 171, *al.* When this subsides, languor or rest has set in: *Th.* II 677-8 *tabe gravatae consedere iubae* and Mulder, Claud. *In Ruf.* II 255 *inclinatque iubas demissaque lumina velat.*

relatum: The dead lion brought back. Not, as Vollm. thinks, 'the recoiling lion' (nor are Verg. *A.* XI 623 and XII 495 parallels for that meaning). For *referre*, 'to bring back', see *OLD* 1a. Perhaps St. thinks of the military expression 'to bring back (spoils from the enemy)', see *OLD* 1b and *Th.* VIII 571 *arma refert*, Caes. *Civ.* III 19, 8 *Caesaris capite relato*, Verg. *A.* IV 93. See 20-3n.

totas duxere in lumina frontes: 'They drew down the whole of their brows upon their eyes'. St. quotes Homer: *Il.* XVII 136 πᾶν δέ τ' ἐπισκύνιον κάτω ἕλκεται ὄσσε καλύπτων. In Homer the *tert. comp.* is rage, here it is shame. The imitation points forward to the comparison of the lion to a soldier (19 ff.), for in Homer Aias is compared to an angry lion. The original also explains *totas* (for which Markl. conjectured *torvas*, printed by Phill.): πᾶν, see II 3, 33 *tota* (n.), and for an imitation of St.: Claud. *In Ruf.* above.

16-23.: Description of death, mixed with *laudatio*, see *Intr.* under **I.** St. describes, in fact, the situation between life and death (18 *a media iam morte*, 20 *moriens*, 23 *animamque...requirit*), see II 2, 45-9n., 19-23n. below.

The first part of this section is couched in general terms (note the abstracts *pudor, animi, virtus, minas*), which already announce the Homeric comparison of the lion to a soldier: *fusum, obruit, ictu, animi, virtus, cadenti, terga dedere.* For the importance of this theme, see *Intr.* under **II.**

16-7. At non te: The dead lion is suddenly addressed, see II 1, 52-4n. The thought progresses thus: *puduit...at non...(sed) mansere...nec.*

novus obruit...ille pudor: Though the lion is overthrown by the first stroke or bite, this unwonted reason to be ashamed does not overwhelm it. For *pudor*, see *OLD* 4a, e.g. III 3, 48, IV 8, 42[11], Ov. *Fast.* V 587.

obruere, to overwhelm, is often employed in a military context, see *OLD* 4a, *Th.* X 540-1 *excercitus...obruitur*, XI 573, IV 6, 69 *obruerat bello*, Sen. *Suas.* 2, 9 *non vincent nos, sed obruent (Persae)*, Luc. VII 390. For the abstract subject with it see e.g. *Th.* IV 490 *timor obruit*, X 194, 282 *sopor*, Liv. XLII 28, 12 *luctus metusque*, Juv. 10, 142 *gloria.*

virtus: A human quality of the lion.

cadenti: Dying ('esp. in battle': *OLD* 9a), see 26.

[11] Not in the Concordance.

18-20. animi: Courage, see *Th.* II 111 *dant animos* and similar beginnings noted by Mulder there (e.g. Verg. *A.* IX 144, Ov. *Pont.* I 2, 85, *Met.* V 47, Luc. II 570), *OLD* 13b.

a media iam morte redit: V 1, 172 *media de morte reversa, Th.* VIII 187-8, 729-30 *mediaque in morte negantem expirare,* XI 555. *Media* serves 'to emphasize the completeness of involvement in the situation described' (*OLD* 4b), *cf.* I 4, 84 *missum media de pace triumphum,* V 2, 108-9 *medii bellare togata strage fori, Th.* XI 250 *mediaque tamen gavisus in ira est.*

For St. himself returning from the verge of death, see III 5, 37 ff.

terga dedere minae: *Terga dare* (*praebere, praestare*) is a military metaphor for 'to fly', see II 6, 93-4, *Th.* V 698 *versusque dolor dat terga timori,* IX 470 (*cf.* 487, 678), Liv. XXII 29, 5, XXXVI 38, 4, Ov. *Met.* X 706, XIV 142-3 *felicior aetas terga dedit,* Koestermann on Tac. *Ann.* XIV 37, 1.

For *minae,* see II 2, 148 and for animals Verg. *G.* III 421 (*colubrum*) *tollentem...minas,* Ov. *Met.* II 857 *nullae in fronte minae* (of a bull), *OLD* 1b. It points forward to *minatur* in 21.

19-23. Sicut...miles...sic: St. clearly alludes to epic poetry here, see II 3 *Intr.*: this is one of the very few formal Homeric comparisons in the *Silvae.* V 2, 22-8 is the only thing comparable to it, where young Crispinus is compared to a race-horse. In V 1, 122-6 and 242-6 the comparisons are rather taken from ethical literature (Priscilla is compared to an Apulian or Sabine house-wife) and daily life (Domitian and Abascantus are compared to a big and a small sailing-ship). See also III 3, 128-30, IV 8, 30-1, V 1, 48-50.

The comparison of a soldier to a lion is very frequent in epic poetry, see Kytzler 1962 (Sts.' epics), Streich 59 ff. (silver epic, incomplete), Cancik 1971, n. 41, e.g. *Th.* IX 189 ff., Hom. *Il.* XX 64 ff., Verg. *A.* XII 4 ff., Luc. I 205 ff. Here St. turns the comparison upside down by comparing the lion to a soldier. The comparison of humans to lions often serves to emphasize their *furor* and *rabies* (see *Intr.* under **II.**, Vessey 1973, 259). Here the discipline and training, the *mansuetudo* of the lion, is emphasized, see *Intr.*, 1n. As E.-F. (126) points out, St. also frequently compares humans to animals in his funerary poetry[12].

The comparison aims more at picturing the soldier and the lion than at formal correspondence: *moriens it* corresponds with *piger gradu, hostem* oc-

---

[12] See, for lions in comparisons in Vergil, e.g. W. W. Briggs jr., *Narrative and simile from the Georgics in the Aeneid* (Leiden 1980), 95-6, who draws attention to Vergil's 'inverting' of comparisons by humanizing animals and other living non-human nature (69 ff., 92-4).

curs in both parts and the two paradoxes *ferro labente minatur* and *animamque hostemque requirit* balance each other; but there is no parallelism.

sicut...sic occurs only here in the *Silvae.*

sibi conscius alti vulneris: Both *conscius* and *alti* enhance the soldier's sense of duty, like *moriens* and the contrast of *attollit* and *labente.*

adversum...in hostem: 'His foe drawn up against him'; see for *adversus OLD* 8a, *Th.* II 563, VI 795, VIII 497. In the *Silv.* the word occurs only here and at V 2, 105. It is found 24 times (25) in the epics.

attollitque manum et...minatur: II 1, 137-9n.

piger...gradu: 'With slow step'. For the abl. of respect with *piger,* see *Th.* II 482 *piger ingenio,* I 292 *impiger alis,* Tac. *Ann.* III 20 *impiger manu.*

firmat...oculos: 'He steadies his eyes'. *OLD* (7b) renders it as 'to put on a set look', and compares Tac. *Ann.* II 57 *convenere firmato vultu.* But *firmare oculos* is better paralleled by *Th.* II 261, 586 *firmare gradum* = '*efficere firmos gradus*' (Mulder on 261; before St. the phrase means '*gradum instabilem reddere firmum*'). *Oculos firmare* means *oculorum aciem reddere firmam* (see *OLD oculus* 3).

hians...animamque hostemque requirit: With open mouth the lion searches for breath and for its foe (snapping at him). The same situation is painted in Sil. X 293 ff. *ceu vulnere tigris letifero cedens tandem proiectaque corpus luctatur morti et languentem pandit hiatum in vanos morsus nec sufficientibus irae ictibus extrema lambit venabula lingua* (comparison of a dying soldier).

Trying to kill when dying is a frequent theme in the Thebaid, e.g. VII 674, see Venini on *Th.* XI 540. It culminates in the duel between Eteocles and Polynices, see esp. XI 562 ff. *nondum ille peractis manibus... animam servabat in iras...vitaeque labantis reliquias tenues odio supplevit...vivisne an adhuc manet ira superstes?*

-que...-que (II 1, 220-2n.) also shows that *animam* and *hostem* belong together. Markl. connected *oculos* and *animam,* which he changed into *animum* (see *OLD* under *firmare* 7b). But see for *animam* also I 4, 106-7 *positos iam segniter artus pugnantemque animam, Th.* I 48 *longaque animam sub morte tenebat,* VIII 638 *servans animam iam sanguine nullo,* its use for 'last breath', e.g. III 3, 19, V 1, 195, Luc. III 578 *luctantem animam lenta cum morte trahentes.*

Both for the ending and for a similar complex emotion, see *Th.* II 127 *simul horret avum fratremque requirit* (Eteocles).

24-30.: *Consolatio.* The *consolatio* proper is introduced by its usual adversative particle (*tamen* 24), see II 1, 183-234n. (also for general information on this part of the *epicedion*).

There is only one argument for comfort: the dead one will live by his merits (*ceu notus...gladiator, inter tot...feras, quas perdere vile est*), see Prop.

IV 11, 71-2, *Epic. Drusi* 215-6, 237-8, 265-6, 465-7, in St. also II 4, 33-6, see E.-F. 150 § 56, Lattimore 241-6, e.g. *CE* 1604 *haec sunt enim mortis solacia ubi continetur nominis vel generis aeterna memoria.* Outside funerary poetry: Ov. *Met.* V 191-2 *magna feres tacitas solacia mortis ad umbras, a tanto cecidisse viro,* Mart. XI 69 *nec queror infernas quamvis cito rapta sub umbras. Non potui fato nobiliore mori.*

This argument is not presented directly, but in two different ways: there is no *descriptio funeris* in II 5 (*cf.* II 1, 157-82n.). One half of the comfort is that everyone mourned the lion, a topic from the *funus,* see II 1, 20n., 175-8n., E.-F. 147 § 49. The other half consists of 'even Caesar mourned', also belonging to *funus*: Prop. IV 11, 58-60 *gemitu Caesaris...et lacrimas vidimus ire deo, Epic. Drusi* 209-10, 466, *Eleg. Maec.* 157-8, see E.-F. *ibid.* § 48. But this last fact is also a supreme kind of comfort: it singles out the lion among many beasts, see II 1, 175-8n. and *cf.* II 4, 26 ff. And it brings the lion in a way to the level of the Emperor himself (*cf.* the somewhat similar compliment to Abascantus at V 1, 238 ff.): the last line, enclosed by *unius...leonis,* implies both the enormous gulf between Domitian and the lion and the sympathy between Emperor and animal, the climax of the lion's humanization (*Intr.*). Apart from this, it is, of course, also a compliment for Domitian's sensibility.

24-7. magna...subiti...solacia leti: For the phrase, see *Th.* IX 17 *pulchra o solacia leti,* Ov. *Met.* V 191-2 above, Phaed. I 9, 8 *mortis...solacio* (or *solacium*), *morti solacium* in *Th.* I 596, IX 664. For *solacia,* see II 1, 200-1n.

For *subiti,* see II 1, 137-9n., *cito* in Mart. XI 69. As to the unexpectedness of the lion's death, see *Intr.* under **IV.**

victe, feres: In this case the dead one himself is comforted. This does not happen elsewhere in Sts.' *consolationes,* except by implication. In animal-poetry comfort is also very rare, see *Intr.* under I (contrast for instance Catul. 3, 16-8). Mart. IX 69 tends in this direction. The apostrophe here implies that the lion had no special person who was involved enough to be comforted (note that Domitian's relationship with the animal is different from that of Melior and his parrot).

victe: 'though you are vanquished', *cf.* 11. St. does not employ this pathetic voc. *victe* elsewhere, but see *Th.* XII 332 *mihi nempe iaces, mihi victus es uni.*

maesti populusque patresque: For *maestus* in connection with the funeral (on 23-30 above), *cf.* e.g. II 1, 174, V 5, 46, *Th.* VI 191.

populusque patresque implies 'everyone from high to low', see Lucil. 1253 (Krenkel) *populusque patresque* and the phrase *populus senatusque* (or *vice versa*) in Cic. *Agr.* I, 12, *Planc.* 90, *CIL* II 5048, 7, *al.*: *OLD* 2b. The

exact phrase does not return in St., but see I 1, 99 *populi magnique senatus*, I 6, 43-4 *omnis ordo...femina, plebs, eques, senatus.*

For the implication of everyone's grief, see II 1, 175-8n., II 4, 24-8n.; for *-que...que*, see II 1, 220-2n.

ceu...notus caderes gladiator: 'As if you were a famous gladiator who had died'. Gladiators on the one hand ranked as the lowest of the low, on the other hand they often aroused admiration and excitement, much as some sportsmen or pop-stars nowadays. Of many gladiators it is known that they became rich and famous, see Mart. *Sp.* 29, 6, V 24, *SG* II[10] 60, Daremberg-Saglio II[2] 1598-9, Grant 94-6, Versnel 1974, 377 and notes (and for an interpretation of Mart. V 24 the whole article). For *notus*, see Suet. *Jul.* 26, 3 *gladiatores notos, sicubi infestis spectatoribus dimicarent, vi rapiendos servandosque mandabat.*

For the similarity of the lion to a gladiator, see *Intr.* under **II.** For *ceu*, see II 3, 4n.

tristi...harena[13]**:** In the sand (-covered arena) of death. For *tristi*, see II 1, 18n.

te...ingemuere mori: The construction of *ingemescere* (or *ingemere*) with acc. and inf. occurs since Cic. (*Phil.* 13, 23[14]): *LHSz.* 358, *OLD ingemescere* a. St. has it also at *Th.* IV 355, VII 822, XI 747, *Ach.* I 238. Venini says (on XI 747) that St. innovated this construction with *ingemere.* This is only true if *ingemescere* and *ingemere* are strictly separated, and if all perfect forms are ranged under *ingemescere*: Cic. *Phil.* 13, 23 *ingemescendum*, Pers. 5, 61 *ingemuere*, Mart. IX 59, 10, see *TLL* VII 1516, 79-1517, 14 and 1519, 3-4.

27-30 magni...Caesaris ora...tetigit iactura: Caesar is great, *cf.* V 1, 165 *magni...numen Caesaris*, V 2, 174 *ingens Caesar.* This is connected with the Emperor-cult in Statius' time, see Sauter, Scott 1933 and 1936, Cancik 1965, 80-100 (also on the importance of size and weight in the Emperor-cult), II 1, 191-3n.

For *ora*, see I 1, 86-7 *Caesaris ora...cervice tulit. Iactura tetigit ora* means not much more than 'the loss touched Caesar', but *ora* may be employed to imply that Domitian wept (or looked sad), esp. since Caesar's tears are mentioned in the parallels in 24-30n. With *tangere*, to move, an abstract subject is usual, see e.g. Verg. *A.* I 162, Ov. *Met.* VII 26, Prop. III 7, 68.

On Domitian's attitude towards killing animals, see *Intr.* under **IV**, Weinreich 1928, 105-6.

---

[13] The Concordance without apparent reason distinguishes between *arena* (2 entrances) and *harena* (28 or 29).

[14] Not 13, 13, as *TLL* VII 1516, 79 ff. claims.

Many poems in Mart. *Sp.* also flatter the Emperor (Titus), e.g. 5, 6, 6b, 16b, esp. 30.

inter tot Scythicas librasque in litore Rheni et Pharia de gente feras: This is in M (but Phillimore rather thought he read *libiresque* or *libicasque*). *Libycasque* is in IQRB[r], see Mar. *app.* At IV 6, 105 M has *libre* for *Libyae.*

It is certain that in *librasque* (assuming that Marastoni is right and that Phill. misread his photograph, *cf.* Mar. VIII) a reference to Libya is hidden. Fr. is the only one to take up Klotz' suggestion *Libyaeque.* St. may well have varied with *Libyae* on *Scythicas*, see II 2, 122 and Kl. *app.* on I 5, 36. But there is nothing to make *Libyae* more probable than *Libycas* (all edd.), and in favour of *Libycas* may count that the two words connected by *que* are syntactically alike, with the variation following, *cf.* also IV 6, 105 *Libyae Scythiaeque.* So I accept *Libycasque*, though certainty is impossible here.

The next obstacle is *in*: *in litore Rheni...feras* seems to be impossible Latin for 'animals from the banks of the Rhine'. There are roughly two types of solution: *in* may be changed into *et*, so that either *litore* must be taken as a separative abl., or *de* is *apo koinou* (which is very rare, see *LHSz.* 835: probably only once in Dracontius). The change of *in* into *et* is effected by the *ed. Aldina* of 1502 and followed by Markl., the *ed. Bipontina*, Kl., Mozl., Clouard.

Or *in* may be replaced by another preposition. *Ab* has been proposed by Baehr. (*a*: Phill.); Cartault's *e* is printed by Fr., Mar., Sb., Traglia(-Ar.); *de* is in Politian's commentary (and unmetrical).

Of alternative solutions (*en*: A. Schilling 40, *tot Scythicas Libycasque inter, tot litore Rheni*: Saenger), only Vollmer's needs to be discussed: he defends M's *in* and changes *feras* into *feris.* He claims that this can be explained as *inter tot Scythicas Libycasque* (*feras*), *in* (*de*) *litore Rheni et Pharia de gente feris.* If, as Vollm. says, '*die Betönung beim Vorträge das Verständnis sichern* (*muss*)', he must have been the only person in history to deliver these lines correctly. His only claim which can be upheld is that *apo koinou* with *in* is frequent (see *LHSz.* above). But for *de* it is extremely rare, and the combination *in* (*de*) is impossible. The variation *inter/in* would be very strange, and it is unclear what *in* could mean here. See also II 1, 64-6n.

When we accept *et* for *in*, it may be remarked that the combination *-que...et...et* is possible (II 1, 67 ff., II 2, 92 ff.) and it may be more attractive than asyndeton. On the other hand, this strongly suggests that *de* is *apo koinou.*

This means that *a* or *e* is probably right. There is not much to choose between them. The fact that *que* ends on *e* is stressed by Fr. and is

probably important to Mar. But it is hardly conclusive. There are some parallels for this construction of *e(x)*: Larg. 122 *muliercula quaedam ex Africa*, see Liv. XXVI 6, 1 *legatus ex eadem legatione*. But the parallels for *a(b)*, coming from, are decidedly better: *Th.* VII 382 *populator ab oris*, X 46 *pingues ab ovilibus aurae*, Verg. *A.* VIII 686 *victor ab Aurorae populis et litore rubro*, Luc. VII 692 *Phario...a gurgite clades*, VFl. VIII 327 *a litore fluctus*, see *TLL* I 16, 59-17, 7, II 2, 68-72n.

Therefore I print *a*, like Phillimore, so that the sentence runs: *inter tot Scythicas Libycasque (feras), a litore Rheni et Pharia de gente feras.*

litore Rheni also ends the line in Ven. Fort. *Carm.* VII 4, 5 p. 155. *Litus* is often employed for the bank of a river, see *TLL* VII² 1540, 4 ff., e.g. I 3, 24, Verg. *A.* VIII 83, Luc. IX 413.

Libycas Scythicasque: the two regions stand for 'south and north', and are often coupled in poetry, see IV 6, 105 above, *Th.* XI 115 *nive Riphae, Libycis...harenis*, Verg. *Ecl.* 1, 64-5, *G.* I 240-1, Luc. X 455 *non Scytha...non...Maurus*, see *Silv.* I 6, 77 *Nilus sacer horridusque Phasis.* Herodotus already knew the scheme and used it in his description of Scythia (Bk. IV), see also Herod. II 33, *RE Suppl.* IV 570.

Rheni...Pharia de gente: One might expect a reference to the Nile, but St. chooses to vary. The reference to the Rhine may be influenced by Domitian's victories there, see I 1, 7, 51, 79, IV 4, 62, V 1, 90, 128, *Th.* I 19 with Heuvel's note on 17, Fr. 15 n. 6.

For the phrase *Pharia de gente*, see *Th.* III 339 *Graia de gente*, I 2, 70-1 *clarus de gente Latina...iuvenis*. Phill. conjectured *Pharia de pube* for *puppe* in V 5, 66. For *Pharius*, see II 1, 72-5n.

feras, quas perdere vile est: *Feras* is chosen with purpose by St.; this is emphasized by *quas...*: the lion is no mere wild beast. *Feras* is contrasted with *leonis*. For *perdere vile est* = *iactura vilis est*, see Ov. *Ep.* 7, 48 *est tibi vile mori.* St. makes the expression pointed by the juxtaposition of *perdere* and *vile.*

unius amissi...iactura leonis: The pleonasm in *amissi...iactura* was defended by Markl. with Ov. *Met.* IX 98 *ablati doluit iactura decoris*[15]. To this Ov. *Pont.* IV 11, 5 *rapti...iactura...amici* may be added. See also II 148-53n.

Unius may be explained as 'just one (negligible) lion' juxtaposed with *magni...Caesaris.* On the other hand, the interpretation 'this unique lion', pathetic with *iactura* and explaining *ora...tetigit* may be right at the same time, see II 2, 68-72n.

---

[15] Markl. did *not* propose to read *ablati* here, as Ellis (1910, 156) suggests. Ellis accepts *natura* for *iactura* out of ms. Barlow 23. This destroys the balance *tot/unius, perdere amissi/vile iactura.* Moreover, this can hardly mean 'its fine qualities' as Ellis explains *natura.*

leonis is the last word of the poem, see II 1, 166-8n., 226-34n., II 3, 77n., 1n. here. Though the fact that the dead one is a lion is not unexpected here (1n., *cf.* 13), the tension between grief and comfort, which is expressed in *tibi* (1)...*leonis* (30) is solved here.

II. 6. CONSOLATIO AD FLAVIUM URSUM DE AMISSIONE PUERI DELICATI

LITERATURE:
See II 1 *Introduction.*

I. In dividing this poem I follow E.-F. (84-7)[1]: **1)** *Introduction* (1-20). The survivor's grief is recognized as just and St. urges lamentation. This section contains elements from the *descriptio funeris* (2-6, 14-5, 18-20) and from the *laudatio* (10-2, 14-7), see II 1 *Intr.* **2)** *Laudatio* (21-57). Beauty is the subject of the long central part (34-47), see II 1, 36-136n. It is framed by *mores* (21-34: 23 *mores*; 47-57: 48 *morum*). The *laudatio* is not mixed with *lamentatio*, though this combination is frequent, see II 1 *Intr.*, II 4 *Intr.*, 1-6n., II 6, 58-70n. **3)** *Lamentatio* (58-70). Its chief subject is the wealth of Ursus (62-8); similarly the *lamentatio* for Glaucias is partly meant as praise of Melior, see II 1, 36-136n., 125-36n. **4)** *Descriptio morbi ac mortis* (70-85). The transition from lament to description is smooth, because *Fortuna* and *Invidia* (68-9) announce *Nemesis* (73) and because it takes place within the line (70). At the end of this description it becomes almost imperceptibly **4a)** *Descriptio funeris* (85-93). This also begins within the verse (85); it is announced by *funera* (84) and by the comparison of Ursus to Philetus' hypothetical parents (82-4). The *funus* contains elements of the *laudatio* (85-6) and ends on a note of grief (*gemitus* 93). See II 1, 157-82n. **5)** *Consolatio* (93-105). It begins with unexpected criticism of Ursus, see II 1, 183-234n. Its main topic is Philetus' reception in Elysium (98-103), which, contrary to II 1, does not open the *consolatio.*

This second poem on the death of a favourite slave in *Silv.* II is far less personal than II 1: the relationship between Ursus and Philetus is left much more vague than that between Melior and Glaucias (*cf.* II 1, 50-54, 56-66, 70-1, 76-81, 102-5, 119, 128-36, 148-53, 191-3, 200-7. In this poem only 15-7, 21-2, 50-3. Contrast II 1, 227-34 with 103-5 here). The boy's appearance and character are described in very general terms (*decor* 36, *decus* 38, *pulchrior* 35) and painted with the aid of comparisons (25-34, 36-7, 42-3, 45-7, 54-5, 56-7). Contrast for Glaucias: II 1, 41-51 (appearance), 56-66, 110-1, 113-4, 117-8 (habits). Ursus' presence at Philetus' death is not mentioned explicitly (82); contrast II 1, 148-53. The amount of time which has passed between death and *consolatio* is not mentioned; contrast II 1, 3-13. St. does not mention his own grief (con-

[1] For the 'main topics', see II 1 *Introduction.* Vollmer does not give a division of II 6.

trast II 1, 17-8), nor his presence at the funeral; contrast II 1, 19-25, 157-74. Ursus does not try to commit suicide after the boy's death; contrast II 1, 24-5n.

Two circumstances must account for this difference: St. was less intimate with Ursus than with Melior, and the relationship between Ursus and Philetus was less personal than that between Melior and Glaucias. Apart from these facts, St. does not want to repeat himself within one and the same book; but this wish rather influenced the choice of this poem for inclusion in *Silvae* II than its composition.

Of the two poems, II 1 and II 6, II 1 is the most important one, because it is addressed to the addressee of the whole book and opens the book. About II 6 St. says that Ursus will credit Melior for it (II *Praef.* 23, see note and II *Praef. Intr.*: perhaps St. felt obliged by external motives to dedicate a poem to Ursus). II 6 is much shorter than II 1. Note also II *Praef.* 5 *Glauciam nostrum*, but about Philetus *amisso puero* 21. On Sts.' relationship with Melior, see II *Praef.*, II 1, II 3, II 4. Of his acquaintance with Ursus we only know because of this poem. For Sts.' skill in praising persons of various intimacy in different ways, see Cancik 1978, 128-9.

The relationship between Ursus and Philetus is one of master and (favourite) slave: the boy is called *famulus* (8, 10, 21), see *servitium* 16, *servilis* 85. He is not named *puer* (except for II *Praef.* 21) or *alumnus*; contrast II 1, 37, 121, 127, 188, 192, 201, *cf.* 20, 155. Philetus was bought, not born in the house like Glaucias (II 1, 72-105n.), otherwise there would have been no doubt as to his descent (see below). Ursus is called *dominus* (35, 82, 89) and *erus* (22, 51). He is not named *altor* (II 1, 69), let alone *pater* (II 1, 103, 119), see II 1 *Intr.*, Fr. 80 n. 1. Though Philetus' death hurts more than the death of a cognate (2-8), it is a *plaga minor* (8).

II. Of Flavius Ursus nothing is known apart of what St. tells us here: he was learned and industrious (II *Praef.* 20-1). He had possessions in Italy, Crete and Africa (II 6, 61-8). Perhaps he was a solicitor (93-5n.). It is probable that if he had held a state-office St. would have remarked on this. An Ursus who held the suffect consulship under Domitian is known but a relationship between the two can not be proved. See *PIR* III n° 404, *RE* VI 2730, Fr. 54 n. 3.

Philetus is a well-known name, both for slaves and free men, see *Onom.* II 474 *col.* 1-2, e.g. *CIL* VI 7, 6, 6774-5.

Titulus: The title, *consolatio ad Flavium Ursum de amissione pueri delicati*, comes very near to Sts.' words in II *Praef.* 19-22: *ad Ursum...scriptam de amisso puero consolationem.* This suggests again that the titles do not stem

from St. himself (see II 1 *titulus* note), esp. because the title of II 1, *Glaucias Atedii Melioris delicatus*, mentions the name of the dead boy, which also occurs in II *Praef.* 5, while the title here does not name Philetus, who is not named in II *Praef.* In the poems themselves both names occur. This title sounds very stiff.

For *Flavium*, see II 1 *titulus* note; for *delicatus*, see II 1 *titulus* n.

1-20. INTRODUCTION: Its central thought is that to set definite bounds to mourning and to give rules for it is cruel, see *Epic. Drusi* 7-12 *et quisquam leges audet tibi dicere flendi*, E.-F. 127 § 2c. This thought is expressed by contradicting two implied theses: **1)** a stranger must not be mourned as deeply as a member of the family, *cf.* V 5, 46-8, Mart. V 37, 20-1 '*deflere non te vernulae pudet mortem? Ego coniugem...extuli...*', Petr. 54, 1 *alienum mortuum plorare*, which seems to be proverbial, *cf.* Sen. *Ep.* 12, 3 *alienum mortuum tollere.* St. contradicts this in 1-8 on purely emotional grounds, esp. 7-8 *vincit plaga.* **2)** A slave should not be mourned as deeply as a free man. St. contradicts this in 10-2 and 14-7 on the grounds that he was an excellent slave, nay even human, and in 18-20 with the *argumentum a fortiori* that even beasts are mourned (which by strict logic should exclude the 'human argument'). The argumentation finds its complement in the exhortation to weep freely (12-4, 17-8). This is supported by praise of the dead boy, which prepares the central antithesis *liber/famulus.* Note the contrast with II 1, 15-7, where the advice to cry is based on therapeutic considerations.

The introduction can be divided into three parts: 1-8, 8-17, 17-20. The contrast slave/free is in the centre; the first and third part each begin with the indignant question who dares to put limits on a grief (this grief). As Newmyer (67, see 65-7) says, 'by the time the poet has reached...17-20, the death of a lowly slave has been rendered significant'.

1-2. Saeve nimis...quisquis: St. enters, as it were, upon a dialogue with an unknown opponent. For the dialogic character of ancient poetry in general, see II 1, 1-3n. Though the addressee of the poem is addressed and mentioned in 10, this poem is exceptional insofar as the first person who is apostrophized is imaginary.

This beginning reminds of the σχετλιασμός, a feature which is especially frequent in the *propempticon* (Cairns 1972, 7, 9, 11-4, 52-3, 56-7, 138). But in consolatory poetry these introductory reproaches serve to justify the grief of the survivors: it is impossible, or heartless, to restrict sorrow because of certain conventions or rules, see V 3, 64-8, V

5, 46-8, 53-6, Hor. *Carm.* I 24, 1-2, *Epic. Drusi* 7 ff. (1-20n. above), Nisbet-H. on Hor. *loc. cit.*, E.-F. 126-7 § 2.

saeve is *aprosdoketon* also in another way, because we expect it to be said of the *consolator* himself, see II 1, 5.

For the thought, see also V 5, 59-61 *o nimium felix, nimium crudelis et expers imperii Fortuna tui qui dicere legem fletibus aut fines audet censere dolendi*, with the same syntactic variation as in *lacrimis...discrimina...lugendi...modos* here.

lugendi...modos: Peerlkamp conjectured *lugendo* (on Hor. *Carm.* I 16, 2-3 *modum pones iambis*). This is printed by Saeng. and defended by Kl. 1896, 5. But see Cic. *Fam.* V 16, 6 *mulier...quae non...lugendi modum fecerit*, Luc. I 82 *crescendi posuere modum*, X 331.

discrimina...modos: A hendiadys, 'differences and limitations', *viz.* differences by (prescribing) different limitations. For the sense 'limitation', *finis*, for *modus*, see *TLL* VIII 1259, 58 ff., Vollm., e.g. Hor. *Carm.* I 16, 3 above (with Nisbet-H.), I 24, 1 *quis desiderio sit...modus.* The plur. is used here because different persons are involved, like relatives and *alieni.*

Therefore St. makes the central idea of the poem not the contrast between real and adopted children (see II 1 *Intr.*), but he puts all the weight on the contrast 'slave/free', with all the nuances and paradoxes which this can involve.

A number of points on freedom and slavery were made in the theoretical and philosophical discussion in Latin literature of which Seneca is the main representative. See Marquardt 192-4, *RE Suppl.* VI 1044 ff. (*Sklaverei*), Rieks esp. 89-115, 102 n. 52: **1)** one must treat one's slaves well (Sen. *Ep.* 47, 13, *Cl.* I 18, 1-2; already in Var. *R.* I 4, 1, I 17, 5, *al.* and, on economic grounds, Cato *Agr.* 56 ff., *al.*, see *RE Suppl.* VI 978-9, Rieks 104). **2)** A slave and a free man are born from the same seed (Sen. *Ep.* 31, 11 and 47, 10, Quint. *Inst.* III 8, 31, Juv. 14, 15-7, Macr. I 116, see *Th.* XII 555-7 and Vessey 1973, 312-3). The first thesis is left aside by St., since it offers little room for point or paradox. He concentrates on a more general form of the second point: **3)** a slave and a free man do not differ from each other, for both are men, *homines.* He connects a related point of view with this contention: character, not birth, is decisive for considering someone as free. See Sen. *Ep.* 47, 1 *'servi sunt'. Immo, homines*, 15-6 *non ministeriis illos aestimabo sed moribus... 'servus est'. Sed fortasse liber animo, Dial.* VII 24, 3 *hominibus prodesse natura me iubet...servi liberine...ingenui an libertini...ubicumque homo est, Ben.* III 18, 2-4 *refert enim cuius animi sit...non cuius status*, 20, 1 and 28, 1-3, Petr. 71, 1 *et servi homines sunt*, Juv. 6, 222, Dio *Or.* 15, 31, Epict. *Diatr.* IV 1, 6-24 and 5, 7. See *RE Suppl.* VI 1045 (with unreliable references), Motto

under *Slaves* 4c, 7, 8, Rieks 103 ff. St. quotes these ideas in 11-2 and 14-7[2].

A change in attitude is reflected in literature and custom: in the first century B.C. manifestations of an intimate relationship between master and slave in the form of epitaphs or publicly mourning the death of a slave in prose or poetry are comparatively rare. Lucil. 579 (M.) is an exception, though the greater part of his 22nd book may have been dedicated to his slaves, see also *CE* 54 and 55. But Cicero still apologizes for his emotions about the death of his slave: *me...plus quam servi mors debere videbatur commoverat* (*Att.* I 12, 4). In the first century A.D. things are changing: graves for the *dominus* and his *familia* together become more common and so do epitaphs from the one praising the other, see *CE* 990, 1867, Lattimore 282. Contrast Pliny's remarks at the death of two of his slaves with Cicero: *Ep.* VIII 16, 3 *Nec ignoro alios eius modi casus nihil amplius vocare quam damnum, eoque sibi magnos homines et sapientes videri. Qui an magni sapientesque sint, nescio; homines non sunt.* Poems on the death of young slaves and *liberti* become more frequent, see Mart. I 88, 101, 114, 116, V 34, 37, VI 28, 29 (II 1 *Intr.* under **III.**), 52, 68, IX 86, X 61, XI 91, *cf.* Plin. *Ep.* VIII 1. This situation probably both reflects a social reality and an ideal of this society where the young and beautiful slave is proof of the master's good taste, see Citroni 271-3, II 1 *Intr.* under **I.**, II 1 *tit.* n. (*delicatus*), II 1, 1n., II 6, 38-47n.

But St. exploits the theme 'free/slave' in a poetic rather than a theoretical way: since the boy is of unknown provenance, he may be of free (21-3), or even noble birth (99-100), see 21-33n., 98-100n. On the other hand, St. sententiously contrasts *dominus* and *servus*: 15-7, 22, 34-5, 50-7, 85, 89, see notes there. This implies extra compliments for Ursus; but it is also clear that St. tends to word-play and ambiguity rather than to philosophy.

2-6. Miserum est...parenti...accendere...durum...conclamare... maesta (sunt): St. enumerates three different kinds of relations, children, wife, brothers and sisters. The construction varies, and so do the words for mourning and grief: *lacrimis* (1), *lugendi* (2), *maesta, lamenta* (5), *gemitus, vulnera* (7), *plaga* (8), *gemis* (10), *fletus* (12), *dolor* (13), *luctus* (18), see II 1, 2n., 128-35n., 157-82n., II 2, 21-5n., 49-51n., II 3, 1-5n., 1-7n., II 4, 1n., 17-23n.

The catalogue has three parts. Each one is shorter and less tragic than the preceding one: the death of a child is the most pitiful item. The pathos which St. employs dies down also: the children are mentioned

---

[2] The opposite sentiment is found in the sardonic lines *Qui se hominem meminit, securo pectore vivat,/nam meus libertus hic iacet in tumulo*: *CE* 1115, see Lattimore 283.

twice (*cf.* V 5, 15 *sub uberibus plenis...natos*, 19 *iuvenem*) and their youth is stressed (*primaeva, surgentes*). Note also the harsh and unusual (below) *accendere.* The wife has also died before her time (*praerepta*, see II 1, 1n.); the empty bed heightens the pathos, see *Epic. Drusi* 328 *quaeris et in vacui parte priore tori* (a climax there). The brothers and sisters are just mentioned. St. prepares and softens with this anti-climax the transition to the slave-boy.

See also III 3, 8-12 *quis...non...primaevae funera plangi coniugis aut nati modo pubescentia credat ora.*

primaeva...pignora surgentesque...natos: *Primaevus* is not necessarily very young: St. employs it for a wife (III 3, 10, *Th.* IV 354) and a husband (V 3, 66); also for young vigorous men (*Th.* III 196). But here it emphasizes the tragic character of the death, like *surgentes*, which is often coupled with hope (Verg. *A.* IV 274, VI 364 = X 524 *spes surgentis Iuli*, Sil. I 112). For *primaevus*, see also Catul. 64, 401 *primaevi funera nati*, Verg. *A.* VII 162.

Pignora is in the vulgate, and printed by Kl., Phill., Mozl., Clouard. The other editors retain M's form, *pignera.* It is true that Priscian says *pignus pignoris et pigneris* (VI 89, 281 K.). But from Neue-W. I 274-6 it is clear that the *-er-* forms belong almost exclusively to prose (Livy prefers *pignera* to *pignora*). The only instances of *pigner-* in poetry are Juv. 9, 141 and Prud. *Psych.* 751.

The mss. are not fully to be trusted in these cases; but that is no reason to keep *pignera* here. M writes *pignora* in all other occurrences in St. (about 25); and M often interchanges *o* and *e* (Fr. 1943 XXXII). It seems improbable that St. himself would have wanted to write the rare *pignera* here.

For *pignus*, child, see II 1, 86-8n.

nefas: Because it is unjust that children die before their parents. For *nefas* as a typical term from the *topos* 'reproaches against the gods', see II 1, 20n., II 5, 11-3n. For these reproaches, see also II 1, 120-4n., II 4, 3n., 58-9n. below, II 7, 89.

Nefas stands often in a parenthesis in St.: V 3, 109, *Th.* III 54 (see Snijder), IV 193, XI 360, XII 83, *Ach.* I 133, *cf.* II 7, 100, 104. In other authors: e.g. Catul. 68, 89, Verg. *A.* VII 73, VIII 688, X 673, Sen. *Her.O.* 1224. See *OLD* 3c.

It is not clear why Saeng. prints his own *nefastum*, which he constructs like *durum.*

accendere: Q, *accedere*: MA*. *Accendere* with a personal object occurs only here and at *Th.* IX 398 *accensure nepotem, cf.* Plin. *Nat.* XXVIII 113 *caput* (*chamaeleonis*)...*et guttur si...accendantur*, Verg. *A.* VII 75 *Lavinia... accensa comas*, see *TLL* I 275, 21-9. But the use of *ardere* for a dead body is

common, see II 1, 158 (n.), 162, V 3, 68, *Th.* XII 345 and often, see *OLD* 1b. *Cf.* also *Th.* XII 60 *fumare Menoecea...sinunt.*

Here, probably in 14-5 (n.) and in 17-20 St. alludes to *funus* in the introduction, see II 1, 19-25 and II 1 *Intr.*

durum et: For the position of *et*, also in the next line, see II 2, 81-2n.

deserti...partem conclamare tori: 'To bewail half of the deserted bed'. For *pars* meaning 'a half, a substantial share', see *OLD* 4b, Nisbet-H. on Hor. *Carm.* II 17, 5, Luck on Ov. *Tr.* I 2, 43 f. In the *Silvae*: III 2, 7, V 1, 177.

conclamare is a term from the ritual of bewailing: Ter. *Eun.* 348, Luc. II 22-3 *cum corpora nondum conclamata iacent*, see *Th.* VI 13 *planctu conclamat uterque Isthmos.* The word refers to the custom of calling the deceased's name; the phrase here is an intricate way of saying (as Mozl. translates) 'to call the name of the partner'.

This is the only instance of transitive *conclamare* in St. (intrans. 5 times).

maesta: II 5, 24-7n.

lamenta sororum...fratrum gemitus: St. probably intends the genitives to be interpreted as objective ones, to put the whole on one line: *natos...coniuge...sororum et fratrum.*

6-8. ad te tamen at procul intrat altius in sensus...plaga: This is M's reading. It seems certain that *alte* must be read instead of *ad te*; the reverse error is in M in II *Praef.* 4 *altae* for *ad te* (n.). The first to suggest *alte* was Markland, who, however, rejected it, see van Dam 397-8. Vollm. was the first to put it in the text, and he is followed by all edd., except for Saenger, who prints his own *ad te tenet*, and Phill., who has his own *alter tamen et procul intrat alterius sensus.* For the repetition of *alte... altius*, see II 2, 83-5n.

Mar. writes *alte haec* for *ad te* (not followed by Traglia(-Ar.)). But the hyperbaton *haec...plaga* is very harsh; *haec* is less probable palaeographically; and it is not really necessary.

Vollm. writes *alte et tamen.* He argues that *et* is needed to connect the thought with 2-6. He explains the whole as '*doch tief dringt auch, nein viel tiefer...*'. This *et* looks also superfluous (*et tamen....at*).

For *at* several conjectures have been made: *ac* (Politian or earlier, see Traglia *app.*, which would correct van Dam 398). *Et* is found in editions before Markl. See for diverse attributions of *et* and *ac* van Dam *loc. cit.* Kl., Mozl., Fr. and Sb. print *ac.* Traglia-Ar. prefer *et.* Vollm. and Mar. retain *at.*

With repetitions (*alte...altius*) *ac* or *et* are unusual, see the instances in II 2, 83-5n. Moreover, some stress seems needed and Vollmer's '*nein viel*

tiefer' seems to be along the right lines (though *a* is also a possibility). Therefore I print *alte tamen, at procul...altius*, with Vollmer's explanation.

procul...altius: this rare use of *procul* with a comparative in the sense of *longe* is not in *LHSz.* and K.-St. The only other instances of it (according to Forc., Hand 1829-45 (vol. 4), Vollm. and *OLD*) occur also in St.: 34 here and probably *Th.* VIII 15 *procul ulteriore barathro.* See also II 2, 83-5n. and 34-5n. below (*ante*).

intrat...in sensus...plaga: for *intrare in sensus*, see Cic. *De Orat.* II 109 *in sensum et in mentem iudicis intrare*, Sen. *Dial.* XII 13, 2 *intrare in pectus* (*timor*). See also III 5, 16 *nec...intrat sensus clamosi turba theatri* ('influence your mind'), Ov. *Ep.* 9, 120 *venit ad sensus dolor.*

plaga, here and in II 1, 4, is '(the blow which causes) the wound'. Markl. explained it as *sagitta*, quoting Verg. *A.* VII 533 and other examples (to support his conjecture *haeret* for *ad te*). But this is improbable in view of II 1, 4, where both *plaga* and *vulnus* occur as cognate terms. For the comparison of a loss to wound, see II 1, 1-13n.

maiora...vulnera: Both 'wider wounds' and 'more important losses', see II 1, 4.

8-17.: This second part of the introduction treats Philetus' character. Its purpose is exhorting to weep: he was a slave, but faithful to you and a truly free man (see *Intr.*): 8-12. So weep freely: 12-4. He was a human being, and a slave only because of his fondness of you: 14-7.

Note the correspondence *famulum...pium,....cui...libertas/hominem.... tuum, cui....servitium*; the pathetic repetitions *famulum* (8, 10), *gemis* (10, 14, *cf.* 18), *hominem* (14, 15), *Urse* (10, 15, see II 1, 166-8n.). See *Th.* XII 555-7 *mitto genus clarosque patres; hominum, inclite Theseu, sanguis erant, homines, eademque in sidera, eosdem sortitus animarum alimentaque vestra creati*, Rieks 223-4.

St. calls Philetus *famulus*, not *deliciae*; see for the juxtaposition III 4, 57 *deliciae famulumque greges* and II 1, 58-9n. With the harsh word *famulus* St. creates an antithesis to the relatives mentioned first. The word serves as a starting-point for Sts.' protestations on the boy's 'free' character, with which he refutes the *saevus* (1-20n., 1-2n.).

8-9. quia rerum nomina caeca sic miscet Fortuna manu: M has *omnia* for *nomina.* Leo's *nomina* (1892, 16) is accepted by all edd., see *Th.* III 657-9 *tua...inani verba polo causas abstrusaque nomina rerum eliciunt?*, Ov. *Met.* V 524-5 *si modo nomina rebus addere vera placet*, Luc. VI 773 *da nomina rebus.*

St. implies that Chance (*Fortuna*) distributes designations (*nomina*) to persons without paying attention to their nature (*pectora*); that is, that words do not belong to things 'naturally', φύσει. That there exists a 'correct relation' between word and thing was held, for instance, by Cratylus

and denied by Socrates in Plato's *Cratylus*. See also Sal. *Cat.* 53, 11 *nos vera vocabula rerum amisimus*, which ultimately goes back upon Thuc. III 82, 4, Bailey on Lucr. V 1028-90. On the other hand St. expresses the idea that the boy *was* a slave by implying that this was caused by Chance's naming him one. This alludes to the theory that a name (designation) is all-important to one's life, see Hirzel 9-17 for many instances. *Quia* explains *famulum*: 'a slave—for that is what Chance made him—, but a pious one', as is shown by *sed...sed.* Therefore Damsté's *quid* (1923, 152) is superfluous.

Does *caeca* go with *nomina*, with *Fortuna*, or with *manu*? *Caeca nomina miscere* is a very improbable expression. Moreover, one expects an allusion to Fortune's traditional blindness: *Tyche*: Menand. *frg.* 417b. *Fortuna*: since Pac. *inc. frg.* 14 (Ribb.) = *Rhet. Her.* II 23, 36, Cic. *Amic.* 54, *Phil.* XIII 5, 10, Ov. *Fast.* VI 576 (with Bömer), *Pont.* III 1, 126, Sen. *Phaed.* 980, Plin. *Nat.* II 22, Otto 1890 n° 694. For the identification of Fortuna/Tyche, see *RE* VII 12-3, Latte 176-83.

That *caeca* is to be taken with *manu*, not with *Fortuna*, is strongly suggested by the parallel structure of 68 *beato/larga redit Fortuna sinu*, III 3, 45 *ingens/supplevit Fortuna genus*, 86 *toto/intravit Fortuna gradu.* In *Th.* XI 650 *maligna/transtulerat Fortuna manu* Venini takes *maligna* and *manu* together. See also II 3, 28-9 *una/emisit contenta manu.* All translations take *caeca* and *manu* together here.

The expression 'Fortune with her blind hand' seems harsh, but see Sen. *Phaed.* 980-2 *res humanas ordine nullo/Fortuna regit sparsitque manu/ mūnĕră cæcā pĕiōră fŏvēns.* It is a bold extension of the use of an epithet with *manus* and similar words to indicate someone's state of mind or character, see *TLL* VIII 349, 75 ff., II 1, 120 *infausta...dextra*, 137 *inimica manus*, V 1, 141 *saeva...dextra.* The device occurs most frequently with adjectives like *dira, saeva, fallax, lasciva*, see *TLL loc. cit.* For *caeca*, see also Luc. III 721-2 *in hostem caeca tela manu...mittit.* For *manus*, see also II 1, 137-9n., 202-5n.

St. often describes a person by a noun + adj. referring to a part of the body, a habit *etc.*, see II 1, 10-2n., 137-9n.

nomina...miscet...manu: St. pictures Fortune as drawing lots, *cf.* Cic. *Div.* II 86 *his* (*sortibus*)...*quae Fortunae monitu pueri manu miscentur atque ducuntur* (about Fortuna in Praeneste). When someone appears before Fortune, as Philetus did, she draws a lot at random, for example one with the word '*famulus*' written on it, and fixes it on the person, without knowing his real worth, *nec pectora novit* (see IV 6, 89-90 *si mores humanaque pectora nosse deis*). Compare also Necessitas with her urn at Hor. *Carm.* III 1, 14-6 and II 1, 218-9n.

For *Fortuna*, see 66-8n.

10-2. famulum gemis, Urse, pium: At this point the poem becomes concrete and personal: **1)** Ursus is addressed for the first time, which is late in the poem, see 1-2n. and II 1, 1-3n. In this respect also the poem differs from II 1 (see *Intr.*). **2)** The situation of mourning is made specific by *has* (11): Ursus is weeping 'now' (*cf.* II 1, 76-8n.). **3)** The dead slave is praised for his specific qualities (esp. 15-7), while in II 1 this is postponed until the *laudatio.*

Urse: m, *ut se*: M. For a possible pun in *Urse, gemis*, see II 2, 23n.

amore fideque: Explain *pium.* The combination of *pietas* and *fides* is common since Pl. *Rud.* 11 and 29, see *TLL* VI[1] 691, 51 ff. In St.: *Th.* II 462, V 627, VII 217, XI 98. *Amor* and *fides* together characterize Atticus' friendship with Cicero: *Att.* II 22, 4 and 23, 3, III 20, 2. In poetry the combination occurs also at Ov. *Tr.* V 14, 41. The piety of Philetus is emphasized by the unusual anaphora of *sed* (for a few examples from Tib., Ov., Juv. and prose, see Vollm., Smith on Tib. I 7, 44-5).

pium...meritum...cui maior stemmate iuncto libertas ex mente fuit: St. already alludes to the *defensio generis* (21-33 below): Philetus' character (*mente, maior spiritus et mores* 22-3) is a substitute for, or a proof of, free birth.

The general meaning of these lines is clear: Philetus was not servile. The difficulty is not so much that St. employs *stemmate* for *quam ex stemmate*, but that he subtly blends two thoughts: **1)** Philetus is *famulus* by birth but *liber* by character. **2)** His 'free' character is worth more than noble birth.

The first idea is what 8-10 have been leading up to, *cf.* Petr. 57, 9 where the freedman boasts *fidem meam malo quam thesauros...annis quadraginta servivi; nemo tamen sciit utrum servus essem an liber.*

The idea of nobility comes in (rather unexpectedly) with *stemma.* This is the 'family-tree', which consists of the *imagines* of the ancestors, joined by lines. It was displayed in noble houses (Plin. *Nat.* XXXV 6, Juv. 8, 1, Marquardt 243, *cf.* II 1, 82-6n.). To possess a *stemma* was a sign of *nobilitas*: IV 4, 75 *stemmate materno felix, virtute paterna*, see III 3, 44, IV 6, 88. Therefore conjectures like *Tusco* for *iuncto* (Phill., *cf.* Pers. 3, 28), emphasizing the idea of nobility, add nothing new and are superfluous.

The juxtaposition (or contrast) of noble character and noble birth is a commonplace: Ov. *Pont.* III 3, 103 *mens tua sublimis supra genus eminet ipsum, Laus. Pis.* 2-14, e.g. 6-7 (*virtus,*) *si desset tibi forte creato nobilitas,...pro nobilitate fuisset.* Juv. 8, 1-145 present the theme at great length: *stemmata quid faciunt...si coram Lepidis male vivitur* (1, 8), *nobilitas sola est atque unica virtus* (20), 40-2, *etc.*, also *CE* 1375, 6 *auxisti mentis nobilitate genus.* See *Intr.* Incomprehension of Sts.' compact way of expressing himself prompted Markland's *nobilitas* for *libertas* and Havet's *virtus* for *iuncto* (1915, 182).

As Rinn puts it, St. implies (esp. by *maior stemmate...libertas*) that '*libertas mentis est potior non solum libertate civili, sed et nobilitate*'. A similar idea is in Mart. II 53, 9-10 *haec tibi si vis est, si mentis tanta potestas liberior Partho vivere rege potes* (where, however, the addressee is not a slave). The idea may stem from rhetoric: Quint. *Inst.* III 8, 31 says of slaves *liberos enim natura omnis et isdem constare elementis et fortasse antiquis etiam nobilibus ortos dici potest* (*ab oratore*), see 99-100 here.

stemmate iuncto is unusual: Vollm. and Fr. explain it by referring *iuncto* to the lines joining the *imagines* of the family-tree ('*une généalogie continue*'). In that case the expression would be pleonastic, for a *stemma non iunctum* does not exist.

It seems more probable that *iunctus* must be connected with expressions like *sanguis iunctus*: *Th.* II 437-8 *propiorque fluat de sanguine iuncto Iuppiter*, Luc. I 111-2, VII 179, see *sanguine iunctus* in Ov. *Met.* III 368, *Fast.* II 788, VFl. I 524, Sil. X 565, Mart. XII 44, 1, *OLD iunctus* 2, 'connected...by kinship'. *Stemmate iuncto* is a pleonasm rather in the sense of 'a family-tree of kinship'. If *sanguis iunctus, sanguis longus* (Juv. 8, 1-2) and *stemma longum* (V 2, 23, see *stemma altum*: Mart. IV 40, 1, V 35, 4) may all be said, *stemma iunctum* is not surprising.

12-4. Ne comprime fletus: For this injunction, see 1-20n. and II 1, 14-5n.

rumpat frenos dolor iste diesque, si tam dura placent: This is in M and printed by Vollm., Mozl., Fr., Mar., Sb. For a critical discussion, see Håk. 72-3.

Vollm. explains *dolor diesque* as a hendiadys '*jener Schmerzentag an dem der Knabe starb*'. But it is highly improbable that St. says to Ursus here: 'weep freely now; let that day which caused you grief know no restraining'. Philetus has been cremated an unknown time ago. St. must be referring to Ursus' present grief, see *has.* Even if the combination is rather to be explained as 'the grief caused by that day (when the boy died)', *dies dolorque* is an improbable hendiadys. Fr. (*app.*) quotes II 1, 55 and V 2, 88; but *hora diesque* in II 1 is different and V 2, 88 is no hendiadys. Apart from that, *dolor diesque* is also a strange subject of *frenos rumpat.*

Saeng. and Fr. explain *dies* as an acc. plur: let your grief break the restraints and the set time (for mourning), interpreting *dies* as *modos* (2). But this sense of *dies* is difficult in itself and the acc. would be very ambiguous for a public.

Domitius read *deisque si tam dura placent.* He is followed by Postg., Kl. and Clouard. This presupposes either a harsh *aposiopesis* (Kl.) or a lacuna after *placent* (Leo 1892, 17, Postg.).

The idea of an acc. parallel to *frenos* was already suggested by Gevaert, who read *deosque*, which is also improbable. Håk. (73) and Traglia-(Ar.), finally, accept Peyrarède's (1658) *decus* (also proposed by Nauke 14). Håk. explains this as 'all bounds of propriety', *cf.* Prop. III 19, 3 *rupistis frena pudoris.* For the sense, see *Th.* XI 318 *non sexus decorisve memor,* V 5, 56-7 *avidusque doloris dicor et in lacrimis iustum excessisse pudorem.* But there are two objections to *decus*: *decus rumpere* is a very unusual expression (not among the many *iuncturae* in *TLL* V^1 246, 15-247, 28) and can only be explained by assuming a hendiadys with *frenos* (*OLD* 2c). And *dolor decusque* would very probably be taken together as nom. sing. by a public.

It seems probable that for *dies* another nom. sing. to be combined with *dolor* is to be read. Some suggestions can be made, e.g. *malumque* (see II 1, 14) or *cladesque* (see *Th.* VIII 195). But these must remain so doubtful that I prefer to obelize *diesque.*

si tam dura placent: (*tibi*). 'If such violent lamentation pleases you'. Thus Fr., Håk. and Traglia-Ar. Vollm., followed by Mozl., supplies *Fatis*, but this is much more difficult. For the satisfaction which is found in lamenting, see II 1, 6, 14-5 (n.), V 5, 56, 63-4. Saeng. reads *si lamenta placent.*

14-5. heu mihi: M, followed by Vollm., Postg., Mozl., Fr. and Mar. The other edd. follow σ in reading (*h*)*ei mihi. Heu* with a dative is virtually non-existent, in St. and elsewhere. It is not clear why the first group assumes that M could not make such a slight error. '*Heu mihi nusquam arte coniungitur... ei perraro invenitur non arte cum dativo pronominis personalis, atque eius quidem primae personae conexum*': Leo 1878, 67.

St. has about 70 instances of *heu*; the dative is not connected with it in any of those. On the other hand, *ei mihi* occurs ca. 15 times. In his predilection for *ei mihi* St. follows Ov. (40-50 instances). St. has it about as frequently as Verg., Tib., Prop. and VFl. taken together. Sil. has it once or twice, Luc. and Sen. not at all.

Fr. vainly defends *heu mihi* with Pl. *Mer.* 661 and Itala *Hier.* 15:10, a bizarre pair and two improbable parallels for St. Moreover, Enk on *Mer.* 624 claims that Pl. says *ei misero mihi*, or (very rarely) *heu miserae mihi*, see Håk. 73-4.

Heu mihi could be kept when punctuatung *heu! mihi subdo ipse faces* (proposed by Merrill 96). But, as Vollm. says, it is Ursus' grief, not Sts.', which concerns St.

See also II 1, 26-8n. on *heu.*

Therefore I print *ei mihi.*

subdo ipse faces: I, the *consolator*, kindle your sorrow, instead of extinguishing it. By praising Philetus, St. makes his loss all the more

poignant. He heightens the tension between grief and comfort (II 1 *Intr.*) by posing as the clumsy doctor (for the contrast with II 1, see 1-20n. here).

For the metaphor, see e.g. Lucr. III 303 *irai fax subdita.* I think that St. again (2-6n.) alludes to *funus*, see *Th.* X 197 *subdere flammas* and Williams, Lucr. VI 1285 *subdebant faces*, Prop. IV 11, 9-10 *subdita nostrum detraheret lecto fax inimica caput, TLL* VI[1] 401-2.

hominem...tuum: A paradox. St. emphasizes that Philetus was *homo* instead of *famulus.* But *homo* with a possessive pronoun means 'your servant', see *TLL* VI[1] 2888, 80 ff. The paradox of the willing slave, who is yet free by character is continued in 15-7.

Phill. (*app.*) prefers MacNaghten's *homo enim*, presumably to avoid the repetition of *hominem.* But the addition of *tuum* makes it no mere repetition, and even that would be unobjectionable, see II 1, 169-72n., II 2, 68-72n.

15-7. cui dulce volenti servitium: For the paradox *dulce servitium*, see II 1, 60-1n. *Dulce* and *volenti* together are pleonastic, for *volenti mihi est* (or *volentibus nobis*) means 'I like'. It is a grecism, after βουλομένῳ μοί ἐστιν, see *LHSz.* 100, Krebs-Schmalz under *volens.* The expression seems to occur only in prose and to be typical for historiography, e.g. Sal. *Jug.* 100, 4, Liv. XXI 50, 10, repeatedly in Tac., e.g. *Ag.* 18, 2, *Hist.* III 43, 2, Fro. 228, 5 (N.), Macr. I 7, 9, see also Koestermann on Tac. *Ann.* I 59, 1, *OLD* 1c.

qui sponte sibique/imperiosus erat: The general meaning is clear: Philetus 'gave himself orders (*imperiosus*) without having to be told to (*sponte*)'. But *-que* causes a problem, see Håk. 101-2. Vollm. explains it as *et qui sponte sibi imperiosus erat.* This ruins the threefold asyndeton *cui...cui...qui* and the postponement of *-que* is unparalleled in the *Silvae* as well as incomprehensible to a hearer/reader (in his index under *que* Vollm. claims that this postposition occurs also at III 5, 59, 75, V 1, 19, but these instances are refuted by Håk. 101-2).

If *sibi* is retained a syllepsis must be assumed, as Kl. and Fr. do: *qui sponte* (*parebat*) *et sibi imperiosus erat*; or the phrase as it stands would mean 'who was exercising authority of his own accord and over himself'. This syllepsis sounds improbable and in this form is very rare in classical Latin, see *LHSz.* 825. The only reason to consider this possibility seriously is that *sibique* must perhaps be kept because it may be an imitation of Hor. *S.* II 7, 83 *quisnam igitur liber? sapiens sibique imperiosus.* St. may very well have had this passage in mind, but unfortunately opinions are divided as to whether Hor. wrote *sibique* or *sibi qui* (see van Dam 398); apart from that, it is not certain what it implies for the text here,

whatever Hor. wrote. Even if Hor. wanted *-que*, in him it extends and explains *sapiens*, while in St. a difficult syllepsis must be assumed.

Markl. considered reading *qui*. But this is virtually impossible, see II 3, 66-7n. (and add Mayer 56-9).

Saeng. is the only ed. not to read *sibique*. He obelizes it and suggests (*app.*) *subacto*. It seems that the sentence can only be rendered intelligible by removing *-que*. The best way to oust it is accepting Heinsius' *ipse*. *Ipse* is sometimes a synonym for *sponte* (Verg. *Ecl.* 4, 43-5), or reinforces it: *Th.* X 914-5 *ipse...sponte tonat*, Lucr. II 1092 *natura videtur ipsa sua per se sponte...agere, OLD ipse* 7. *Sponte...ipse* stress how eager Philetus was to be under orders. *Ipse* may have fallen out because of *ipse* in 15 and *-que* introduced by a scribe to restore the metre.

imperiosus reverses the relation master/slave, see II 1, 56-66n., 60-1n.: *imperiosus* is a word for the *dominus*, see Pl. *Ps.* 996 *ita erus meus imperiosus est*, Sen. *Ben.* III 18, 2. *Sibi* reverses the situation once again.

17-8. Quisnam haec in funera missos castiget luctus?: This is the conclusion out of 10-7. The stress is on *haec*: such a person deserves grief. 17-8 also introduce the last argument, even animals are mourned (see 1-20n.).

In funera missos luctus is translated by Fr. and Mozl. as if they read *hoc in funere* ('at such a death'), which would indeed be easier, see also V 3, 85 *quis non in funere cunctos/...* For *in* + acc. here, see *Th.* V 491 *nos...in funera laetae*. *Missos* either continues the metaphor of the reins (13), as Vollm. thinks, see *OLD* 1; or it is an extension of *mittere vocem etc.*, e.g. *preces* (Hor. *Epod.* 5, 86), see *OLD* 11 and 96 here, where *luctus* means also 'manifestations of grief'.

castiget: the *saevus* is considered as refuted here (1-2, 8-17n.).

18-20.: Four examples of animals which are lamented (18-9) and even buried (20). Cancik (1965 n. 22) notes a tripartite structure here, see II 1, 184-8n. This is true in a sense, if *volucres* and *cervus* are considered as one example. On the other hand, the unexpected *Maronem* (below) rather separates them. As so often (II 2, 88-102n., II 2, 34-5n., 52-62n., 83-5n., 118-20n., below 45-7n.) a (pseudo-) *Mythologem* closes the pericope.

gemit inter bella peremptum Parthus equum: The Parthian is mentioned as an outstanding lover of horses, because he employs them in war, see Nisbet-H. on Hor. *Carm.* I 19, 11, Otto 1968, p. 197. Thence *inter bella*. A close tie between Parthian and horse existed also outside war, see Just. 41, 3 *illis* (*equis*) *bella, illis convicia, illis publica ac privata officia obeunt*, Herod. VI 5, 4 ἐκ παιδῶν συν αὐτοῖς ἀναστρέφονται.

Parthus: the use of the collective singular occurs both in the low and in the elevated style: Quint. *Inst.* VIII 6, 20-1 *Quod genus* (sing. for plur. and *vice versa*) *non orationis modo ornatus, sed etiam cotidiani sermonis usus recepit* (*Rhet. Her.* IV 33, 45 *festivitatis gratia*). It occurs most frequently for foreign peoples in a military context, see Nisbet-H. on Hor. *Carm.* I 19, 12, Löfstedt 1942², 13 ff., esp. 22. St. is not exceptionally fond of it. In the first two books of the *Silv.* it occurs only here and at I 4, 79 (perhaps also II 2, 116). Here it is a rather mechanical variation on the plur. *Molossi.*

For use of the plur. for the sing., see II 7, 115n.

For the burial or cremation of horses, see Plin. *Nat.* VIII 154-5, II 4 *Intr.*

canes flevere Molossi: The Molossi of Eastern Epirus are mentioned because their dogs were the dogs *par excellence* of antiquity, see e.g. Verg. *G.* III 405, Hor. *Epod.* 6, 5, *RE* VIII 2548, XVI¹ 25. The plur. and sing. vary; so do the perfect and the present tense, see *LHSz.* 318.

For the funeral of dogs, see II 4 *Intr.*

volucres habuere rogum: See Plin. *Nat.* X 122, II 4 *Intr.* and II 4, 33n.

cervusque Maronem: 'And a stag had Vergil' (*Marone*: M, *Maronis*: Q, *Maronem*: Peerlkamp, followed by all edd.). St. refers to Verg. *A.* VII 475, where the death of Silvia's stag is told, which started the war between the Trojans and the Rutuli. In *Th.* VII 564 ff. St. emulates the story, see Vessey 1973, 275 n. 2. Silius has an own version too in XIII 115. Mart. XIII 96 alludes to the story.

Cervus Maronem is an unexpected pointed semantic variation on *volucres habuere rogum.* This becomes all the more clear because the syntax remains identical (note also *-que*). St. intends this as a climax: a slave may be mourned, for animals were also mourned; one has even been immortalized by Rome's greatest poet (not a barbarian Parth or Molossian). *Maronem* outdoes *rogum.*

21-57. LAUDATIO: The *laudatio* has three parts: 21-33, 34-47, 48-57. Beauty has the central position (see *Intr.*) and it is again combined with splendour (II 1, 36-136n.): 36-7, 41-3, 44 *micantes.* Both the first and the last part of the *laudatio* are characterized by *mores* (23, 48). The whole is framed by a reference to the main idea behind the poem: *famulus* (21) and *Eumaeus* (57n.). The theme is connected with *mores*, because the first part treats of Philetus' non-slave-like appearance in spite of his desiring Ursus for his master; the last part treats his slave-like and and the same time non-slave-like behaviour. The structure of 21-3 and 54-8 is: slave/non-slave...non-slave/slave.

Apart from the differences with II 1 mentioned in the *Intr.* under **I.**, the *laudatio* here is also shorter than in II 1, and the shortest of all Sts.' *laudationes*: 35% of the whole poem. In II 1 it is 43% of the poem, in III 3 59%, in V 1 38% and in V 3 60%, see Newmyer 67 n. 1. In the absence of details from real life mythology plays a great role in the *laudatio* (25-33, 42-8, 54-7). Mythology is generally functional in St., see II 1, 88-102n., and it is so here, see 25-8n., 30-3n. But it may also be a substitute for concrete details here, in view of its comparative absence in other *laudationes* (III 3, 57-8, 80-3, 131-4, V 1, 57-60, 101-4).

The order in this *laudatio* is also different from that in II 1: there appearance, character, birth, capacities are treated; here the order rather is birth, appearance, character. Note that there is almost no *lamentatio* here, and no praise of Ursus, except for 22 (n.) and 35-7. St. has inserted this into the *lamentatio*. Apparently Ursus did not try to educate the boy (contrast II 1, 102-19, 128-36).

21-33.: The first part proceeds by subtle association: 21-3 take up the topic free/slave and suggest that Philetus is no slave; 25-33 compare Philetus to heroes and thereby suggest not only free birth, but high birth (10-2n.), with *non, nec* (II 1, 8-12n.). St. underlines this with the emphatic claim to autopsy in 29-30, where *vidi* (II 1, 22n.) points back to 21.

24-5 characterize this part as a *defensio generis*: when someone is not of high birth his deeds are praised (Quint. *Inst.* III 7, 10 *aut...respondisse nobilitati pulchrum erit aut humilius genus illustrasse factis*); or any other defence is made: he was born in the house (II 1, 72-5n.); his parents or he himself have been freed (II 1, 77-8, III 3, 68-9, V 5, 73-7); he was born in a noble city (III 3, 44-70); nobody is independent (III 3, 48-58); he has served an Emperor and was honoured by him (III 3, 44-70, 138-45). Here Philetus' noble character (see 12) is argued as a substitute for or proof of free birth, besides the suggestion that he may not have been born a slave. See Vollm. on I 4, 68, E.-F. 136 § 26.

The idea that Philetus may be of noble birth reminds of comedy, novel and rhetoric, see Fr. 81 n. 3, Hor. *Carm.* II 4, 15-6 with Nisbet-H., Petr. 57, 25-6n. below, 30-1n.

21. Quid si nec famulus: A new pericope begins here, not indicated by any editor, except for Clouard.

Quid si is colloquial and means 'perhaps: 'perhaps he was not at all a slave', see Hofmann 67, 191. It also occurs at Cic. *Att.* VII 3, 2, *Fam.* XIII 47 *quid si hoc melius*, see Petr. 42, 5 and 7, Mart. I 35, 6, III 65, 10. St. has similar colloquialisms at *Th.* VI 14 *quidni ego* and *Ach.* I 767 *quid nisi*, see *LHSz.* 458.

For *nec*, see II 2, 54-6n.

21-3. habitus: His manner (*OLD* 3). It is contrasted with *spiritus* and *mores*. Insofar as Philetus could consciously express himself, he wanted Ursus as a master. But he could not help that his free character showed itself in his appearance (*manifesti*). This is also a compliment for Ursus.

te tantum cupientis erum: St. implies the same praise for Philetus as *CIL* VI 37806 *patrono dum vixsit placuit*, see *CIL* I^2 1259, IX 3741, XI 947, XII 4756, Lattimore 283. But St. is much more sophisticated.

te: Ursus, see II 1, 52-4n.

sed maior...spiritus: *Sed* is a contrast only with *cupientis erum*, so conjectures (*sic*: Krohn, *spe*: Housman 1906, 43) are superfluous.

maior spiritus: a more proud look, *cf.* Verg. *A.* V 647-8 *divini signa decoris...notate...qui spiritus illi*, Hor. *S.* II 3, 310-1 *corpore maiorem spiritum et incessum.* Here *maior* means 'more than a slave's'.

tenero...in sanguine: 'In spite of his youth'. The use of *sanguis* to circumscribe age is not in Forc., Lewis & Short, *OLD.* Here St. employs it because *sanguis* means 'descent', 'high birth' (*OLD* 8, 10), *cf.* II 7, 86, V 2, 17, V 3, 116.

mores: Virtuous character, *cf.* II 1, 103, Prop. IV 11, 101 *moribus et caelum patuit*, Sen. *Ag.* 112, *OLD* 4c.

24-5. Optarent multum Graiae cuperentque Latinae sic peperisse nurus: An imitation of Catul., Verg. and Ov. See Catul. 62, 44 *multi illum pueri multae optavere puellae* (a flower to which a girl is compared), Verg. *A.* XI 581-2 *multae illam frustra Tyrrhena per oppida matres optavere nurum*, Ov. *Met.* III 353 *multi illum iuvenes, multae cupiere puellae* (Narcissus). St. has imitated these lines also at *Th.* II 161-3 *has...optavere viri...et Achaea per oppida matres* (see Mulder) and at I 2, 76-7 *quamvis Ausoniis multum gener ille petitus matribus.*

The most insteresting thing here is Sts.' creativity: in the first place he clearly imitates all three of his predecessors together. Secondly, he is the first poet to use this phrase not for an ideal partner, son in law or daughter in law, but of a mother's own son; he retains *nurus* from his examples, but changes its sense.

When *nurus* does not mean 'daughter-in-law', it means 'young woman', 'young married woman', or simply 'woman', esp. in Ov. The word does not occur in Hor., Tib., Prop., see *OLD* 2, Bömer on *Met.* II 366, Korn-Ehwald on III 529. It is often juxtaposed with *matres*, thereby suggesting that a *nurus* has not yet borne children: *Th.* XI 183, XII 786, Verg. *A.* XI 215, Ov. *Met.* III 529, IV 9, XI 216, *Ep.* 16, 185-6, *Epic. Drusi* 204, Luc. V 307. The only instances where *nurus* is connected with having children are this line and *Silv.* II 2, 147. At *Th.* V 200 *nuptaeque*

nurusque on the other hand, St. suggests the equally unusual meaning 'unmarried woman'[3]. See also II 2, 147n.

A third point is *Graiae...Latinae.* This is not in Sts.' examples; nor is it much to the point, for all mythological persons which follow are Greek. Apparently St. likes these polar expressions with Latin/Greek. They do not occur in Verg. and only twice in Ov. (*Fast.* V 196, *Tr.* III 39). Similarly in III 5, 44-5 St. writes *fides...qua veteres Latias Graias heroidas aequas*, where only Greek examples follow. Vollm. remarks there: '*Dass St. nur...Griechinnen anführt hat seinen Grund in den griechischen Beispiellisten der Schule*'. But St. did not mechanically copy lists; he is perfectly able to find Latin examples if he wants them (e.g. Rhea Silvia and Acca in II 1, 99-100, Pompey and Cato in II 7, 68-9, 115, I 1, 28 *etc.*).

Sts.' preference for the combination of Greek and Latin must also be seen in the light of his own background: he was born in Greco-Roman Naples and educated by his father, who was born in Greco-Roman Velia, went over to Greece to take part in poetical competitions and taught Greek poetry (V 3, 124 ff.). In short, St. was imbued with Greek culture. It is perhaps no coincidence that most lines where Greek and Latin are pointedly juxtaposed refer to these facts: III 3, 44-5 above, III 3, 94-5 *libertatemque Menandri quam Romanus honos et Graia licentia miscent*, II 1, 113-4, V 3, 127-8 *Latiis ascita colonis Graia...Hyele.* See II 2, 72-97n., 95-7n., d'Arms 165-7, PP 25-7 (see II 2 *Intr.*), 403-4. That Sts.' background is important does not exclude a personal preference for polar expressions, see II 1, 220-2n, Marouzeau 1935, 281 ff., Schrijvers 1973, 152-3.

A last implication of *Graiae Latinae* is that it suggests 'all', in contrast with the small slave Philetus, see II 1, 175-8n.

multum: 'ardently'. For this adverbial use, see *TLL* VIII 1616, 70 ff., Kiessling-Heinze on Hor. *Carm.* I 25, 5 '*Allerdings ist* multum *auch beim Verbum nie einfach* = saepe, *sondern geht auf Ausdehnung oder Intensität der als Ganzes gefassten Handlung*'. See e.g. Verg. *A.* VI 481, XI 49.

sic points forward to *talem* (25), *talis* (27), see II 1, 178-82n.

25-8.: Philetus was more noble than Theseus and Paris. The two examples are full of subtleties in their wording and associations, see II 1, 88-102n., II 1, 112-3n.

Both Theseus and Paris came from royal houses and in both cases there was some initial doubt about this: after Theseus, educated by strangers and his grandfather, was recognized in the nick of time by his father, he went incognito to Crete (see *RE Suppl.* XIII 1057-8, 1082).

---

[3] Forc. explains *nurus* here as *virgines aliquando nurus futurae.*

Paris was also educated away from his family '*jusqu'à l'anagnorisis*' (Fr. 81 n. 4, see 21-33n., *RE* XVIII[4] 1492).

Perhaps Theseus and Paris are also combined here because of the well-known story of Theseus' raping Helen (*RE Suppl.* XIII 1161 ff., Ov. *Ep.* 16, 349 *te* (= *Helenam*) *quoque qui rapuit, rapuit Minoida Theseus*, a combination of Paris (the writer), Helen (the addressee), Theseus and Ariadne. See also 149-54, 329, *Ep.* 17, 35).

Both heroes are characterized by a negative adjective: *superbus, rusticus.* This emphasizes Philetus' superiority over them. It is also apt for the situation in which they are pictured by St.: Theseus, *superbus*, with Ariadne, whom he will leave at Naxos. *Rusticus* alludes to Paris' education as a herdsman: Soph. *frg.* 90, Eur. *Iph. Aul.* 180, 574, 1291, *Hec.* 645, 944 βοτήρ, *pastor* in Hor. *Carm.* I 15, 1 (with Nisbet-H.), see Carter for many similar adjectives. In St.: I 2, 43, 214, *Ach.* I 20-1.

Sts.' inclination to pictorial details is clear here (II 1, 92-3n., 178-82n.): Theseus is just making his way out of the labyrinth and Paris is pushing his boat into the sea. The main *tert. comp.*, nobility, disappears behind these scenes.

St. characteristically varies: *Cressa* (nom.), *Thesea* (acc.)/*Paris* (nom.), *amores* (acc., no name). *Thesea* is at the end of the sentence with its adj. in the preceding line; *Paris* is in the beginning of the sentence with its adj. in the following line, both are in strong hyperbaton. See II 1, 88-102n., 140-5n., 178-82n.

Cressa...callida: Ariadne. This name is metrically difficult in the hexameter (see Norden on Verg. *A.* VI 28) and St. never employs it. He circumscribes Ariadne at I 2, 132 (*cf.* 224, 228), I 6, 88, V 1, 232, *Th.* XII 676 *absumpto pallentem Gnosida filo.* For *Cressa*, the girl from Crete (not elsewhere in St.), see Ov. *Am.* I 7, 16, *Ep.* 2, 76.

Ariadne is *callida* because she thought of making Theseus take one end of the thread into the labyrinth, while she held the other end.

sollicito...filo: Enallage: Ariadne was *sollicita* for Theseus' safety while she was waiting for him holding the thread. Fr. explains: '*Thésée pour qui la subtile Crétoise imagina, en son inquiétude, le fil qui rassura son retour*'. For the enallage, see also *Th.* IX 603 *verba...sollicitas matrum solantia curas.* The enallage is a.o. caused by the tendency to provide each noun with one adj., see II 1, 137-9n., *LHSz.* 61, 160-1, 444.

Oebalios...amores: For *Oebalius*, Spartan, since Verg. *G.* IV 125, see II 1, 112-3n., also 110-1n.

Amores for *homo amatus* occurs since Pl. *Poen.* 207, see *TLL* I 1970, 9 ff. In St.: I 2, 204, *Th.* I 272 (see Heuvel). The plur. is much more frequent than the sing. in this sense, see Löfstedt 1942[2], 35 and Bömer on Ov. *Met.* I 452.

Paris appears in his traditional role of the adulterer, see I 2, 213, V 1, 57, *Ach.* I 20-50, II 50-65. For his seductive looks, see Nisbet-H. on Hor. *Carm.* I 15, 20.

visurus: II 1, 52-4n.

invitas deiecit in aequora pinus: The pines (ships, see *OLD* 2a, Lunderstedt 56, since Verg. *Ecl.* 4, 38) were unwilling to sail, because the destruction of Troy would be the outcome, see *Ach.* I 20-22 *pastor Dardanus...plenaque materni referens praesagia somni*, Ov. *Ep.* 16, 119-24.

Elsewhere in St. *pinus* for a ship refers to the Argo (*Th.* III 518, V 336, 338, *Ach.* I 156), *cf.* Hor. *Epod.* 16, 57. Nevertheless he can not be said to allude to the topical *schetliasmos* against sea-faring (see II 7, 48-53n., Smith on Tib. I 3, 37 ff.).

deiecit: III 2, 55 *deiecit in aequora pontem.* There and elsewhere in St. it refers to violent throwing rather than to pushing, as is usual with ships, see e.g. V 3, 208 *montem deiecit in urbes*, Luc. III 660, 691. In *TLL* V[1] 393, 38 ff. no good parallel for 'pushing into the sea' occurs. Here the ships must be 'thrown' into the sea, because they do not want to sail.

29. Non fallo: 'I am not lying', *cf.* Prop. II 20, 16, IV 7, 53, V 11, 27 *si fallo, TLL* VI[1] 181, 42-3, 65 ff. St. emphatically protests the truth of his claims: *vidi* 21 (II 1, 50n., 21-33n. above), 30, also *non...licentia ducit* here and the fourfold *non/nec* in 28-33, see II 1, 22n., 50n.

cantus adsueta licentia ducit: '(nor) does its normal licence lead my poetry'. For the theme of *licentia*, poetical imagination, see II 1, 50n., Phaed. IV 26, 8 *usus poeta moris est licentia,* Col. IX 2, 2. The rhetors usually mean by *poetarum licentia* stylistic freedom: Cic. *De Orat.* III 153, *Brut.* 316, Tac. *Dial.* 26, 2, Quint. *Inst.* X 1, 28, XII 10, 73.

For *ducit*, see *OLD* 17 'to lead on (into a false or undesirable position)', e.g. Prop. II 17, 1 *promissis ducere amantem,* Ov. *Met.* VIII 123, Verg. *A.* V 5-7.

St. employs *cantus* for poetry, esp. his own, also at II 7, 47, IV 4, 50, IV 7, 7, V 3, 92, 205, 235.

30-3.: Philetus was also nobler than Achilles or Troilus. Here, I think, St. alludes to divine rather than royal birth, for an ultimate climax: Achilles was the son of Thetis and Troilus is sometimes said to have been a son of Apollo: Apollod. III 12, 5, Lycophr. 307 and scholia, see Fr. 81 n. 4. These sources are obscure; but Sts.' father read and explained Lycophron (V 3, 157). St. suggests divine birth by naming Thetis and Apollo in 31-2.

St. maintains subtle associations (25-8n.): Achilles follows on Paris because of their role in the Trojan war, see II 7, 93-7n., *RE* XVIII[2] 1511-2. Achilles killed Troilus before he was himself killed by Paris.

Both Achilles and Troilus, like Philetus, died young. (Achilles is the most popular example of a παῖς ἄωρος in Greek verse-inscriptions, see Griessmair 87, 89). Compare also II 1, 178-82n.

As in the first pair, the first hero has one line and a half, the second one two lines. Achilles ends the line and Troilus begins it. Both are accompanied by a similar participle.

qualem nec bella caventem...Achillem: *Vidi...qualem nec...caventem...occultavit* is equal to *vidi...talis erat qualis nec erat Achilles cum mater eum occultavit, pulchrior et nobilior enim erat quam Achilles.*

For *caventem* some edd. read *canentem* (:σ): Markl. (in his *errata*), Vollm., Postg., Mozl. They quote *Ach.* I 188 *canit ille libens immania laudum semina.* They argue that it was not Achilles who feared the war, but Thetis. But, as Fr. points out (*app.*), *cavere* means 'to avoid', 'to keep away from', in a neutral sense: *vitare,* see *Th.* VI 780, 793, *OLD* 6, e.g. Ov. *Fast.* VI 222 *tempora...apta...quaeque cavenda.* Saenger prints his own *canente...virgineum.*

litore virgineo: The island where only girls live, *viz.* Scyros. See *Ach.* I 283 ff., esp. 292 *virginitas matura toris.* The adj. is used loosely, as at *Ach.* I 344 *virgineis Therapnis,* Prop. III 14, 2, Mart. I 70, 4 *virgineam domum* (the house of the Vestals), *al.*

For *virgineus* instead of *virginum,* see II 1, 124-5n., Brinkgreve on *Ach.* I 88.

St. alludes to the story of Achilles on Scyrus, where Thetis had hidden him, disguised as a girl, to keep him away from the Trojan war. For Sts.' predilection for Achilles, see II 1, 88-9n. This story must have been esp. dear to him, see II 2, 45-9n., e.g. *Ach.* I 356-7 *fallit...ambiguus tenuique latens discrimine sexus.*

The story appears first in Soph. *frg.* 509, 517, *cf.* Eur. *frg.* 682-6, 880. It was very popular in art: Polygnotus painted it already (Paus. I 22, 5, *cf.* Plin. *Nat.* XXXV 134). It appears often in Pompeian frescoes, see *Encicl. Arte Antica* under Achilles, Dilke *Ach.* p. 10-2, Legras 1908, 38.

occultavit: Like Philetus, Achilles seemed something else than he was.

Achillem: M. *Achillen*: M[1], printed by Saeng., Mozl., Postg., Fr., Mar., Sb. Yet there is ample reason to retain *Achillem,* following Housman's general remarks (1910, 251, 259-60): *Achilles,* like *Ulixes,* is a Latin word, which is not found in any Greek author. *Achilles* and *Ulixes* have the forms of the Latin 3rd and 5th declension: a genitive in *-ei* and *-is,* an ablat. in *-ē* and *-ĕ.*

The acc. is in *-em* or *-en* according to the mss. The forms only occur where both are metrically possible. But in poetry *-em* has by far the most authority. Of grammarians only Probus mentions *Achillen* (*Ulixen* is

never found in grammarians). Though Latin poets use some Latino-grecian forms, there seems to be none of these where a Greek form is grafted on a Latin word.

Only once in the Thebaid and Achilleid are the mss. almost equally divided into *-em* and *-en, Th.* VI 718, where editors eagerly print *Ulixen,* mainly on the authority of P. Everywhere else *-em* is the only reading, or the one with by far the most authority. P is virtually the only ms. which sometimes has *-en* (*Achillen* 9 times, *Ulixen* 3 in the *Ach.*). The ms.-tradition of the *Silvae* can not be conclusive, see also Norden 1912[2], *Anhang* VI 6.

So *Achillem* is the only right form. It is irrelevant whether the scribe who corrected M wrote *Achillen* of his own accord or on the authority of a ms.

circum saevi fugientem moenia Phoebi Troilon: St. depicts Troilus while he is fleeing round the walls of Troy, pursued and killed by Achilles. The usual version of the story is that Achilles ambushed Troilus near a source or near the temple of Apollo, while he was exercising his horses (and therefore presumably unarmed). See *2RE* VII[1] 601 ff. (Lesky), Fr. 81 n. 3, Nisbet-H. on Hor. *Carm.* II 9, 16, Austin on Verg. *A.* I 474.

Vergil's version is different: *fugiens amissis Troilus armis infelix puer atque impar congressus Achilli fertur equis curruque haeret resupinus inani* (*A.* I 474-6): Troilus was armed, and the place of the scene is left vague.

St. seems to follow yet another, unknown tradition here and at V 2, 121-2 *Troilus...gyro leviore minantes eludebat equos.* Whether Troilus has been armed or not is not clear; but Achilles seems to pursue him here around the walls of Troy, *moenia Phoebi,* because Phoebus built them (Hom. *Il.* VII 452 ff., XXI 441 ff., Apollod. II 5, 9, see Fr. *loc. cit.*, but also below). Perhaps St. knew an elaboration of the story (whether purely literary or not), where Hector and Troilus are doublets. That such a version existed is implied by Aus. *Epit.* 18 *Hectore prostrato...congressus saevo Troilus Aeacidae raptatus bigis fratris coniungor honori* (for the imitation of Vergil, see *A.* I 475, II 272). Venini (1969) contends that St. in general adds picturesque elements to myths rather than follows lost sources. This may be true here; but it would not explain Aus. *Epit.* 18. See also II 1, 178-82n.

moenia Phoebi could hardly mean something other than 'the walls of Troy': *moenia* refers almost always to the walls of a city (but note III 1, 16, see also *TLL* VIII 1327, 51-5), *cf.* II 2, 96-7 *Dicarchi moenia,* Ov. *Ep.* 1, 67 *moenia Phoebi* = Troy, *moenia Cadmi* = Thebes (*Th.* IX 520, 640, XI 40, Claud. *Rapt.* III 327), *moenia Telegoni* = Tusculum (Prop. II 32, 4, Ov. *Fast.* IV 71). See *TLL* VIII 1329, 31-43.

saevi...Phoebi: Phoebus is cruel, because he did not help his son Troilus. St. may imply a parallel with Hector here too, since Hector is abandoned by Apollo in Hom. *Il.* XXII 202-13. On the François Vase Apollo and Athena join in the pursuit of Hector.

circum...fugientem moenia: *circum* goes with *moenia*. There is no tmesis of *circumfugere*, for that verb does not exist. For other cases of (light) hyperbaton with prepositions in St., see II 1, 64-6n., II 5, 27-30n.

Troilon: Troilus was generally regarded as a boy or youth, see e.g. *A.P.* XII 191, 4 (Strato) ἐχθὲς Τρωΐλος ὢν πῶς ἐγένου Πρίαμος, on a boy with a new beard (*cf.* 44-5 below). Troilus appears as an example of *mors immatura* in Call. *frg.* 491 (quoted by Cic. *Tusc.* I 93 and Plut. *Cons. Apol.* 113 e). See Nisbet-H. on Hor. *Carm.* II 9, 16.

Haemoniae deprendit lancea dextrae: 'The lance from the Thessalian hand'. For *Haemonius*, see II 1, 88-9n. For the perf. form *deprendit*: II 2, 18n. Achilles has changed from a passive figure into a killer, *cf.* 31.

34-47. Praise of Philetus' beauty: It begins in general terms, by praising Philetus' beauty, closing with a mythologic topic: 34-7. Its longer part praises the boy for his manliness, by stating that he is not effeminate, but a manly youth. By this construction (not...but) St. points to the ambiguous beauty and age of Philetus. This part ends also with mythology (38-45, 45-7). See also 21-57n.

34-5. Qualis eras!: The pathetic exclamation is the only thing in the *laudatio* which comes near to a *lamentatio.* St. emulates Verg. *A.* II 274 *ei mihi, qualis erat*, infusing it with more pathos by the change to a second person, see II 1, 155-7n., II 4, 1-3n.

procul en...pulchrior: For *procul* with comp., see 6-8n. For *en*, see II 1, 17-8n.

et tantum domino minor: Similar compliments are found in III 4, 44-5, *tu puer ante omnis, solus formosior ille cui daberis*, IV 2, 25 *et tantum domino minor* (Domitian's palace), Verg. *Ecl.* 5, 44 *formosi pecoris custos formosior ipse*, Petr. 28, 4 *puer...domino Trimalchione deformior*, which suggests that the phrase was trite enough to be parodied.

minor: (*pulchritudine*)

Illius unus ante decor: 'Only his beauty surpasses yours'. On *illius*, see II 1, 27-8n. *Ante* as an adverb with comparative meaning occurs only here, see *TLL* II 131, 3-6 (Cic. *Off.* III 71 *mala bonis ponit ante* is a case of anastrophe). See also on *procul* 6-8n.

quantum praecedit clara minores luna faces quantumque alios premit Hesperos ignes: The idea that someone surpasses others, like the moon (or sun) or Hesperus/Lucifer outshine the other heavenly

bodies is a commonplace since Sappho 34 ἄστερες μὲν ἀμφὶ κάλαν σελάνναν/ἀψ' ἀκρύπτοισι φάεννον εἶδος/ὀππότα πλῆθοισα μάλιστα λάμπῃ γᾶν, see Nisbet-H. on Hor. *Carm.* I 12, 48 *velut inter ignes luna minores*, with many parallels.

The moon and Lucifer together are also mentioned at Ov. *Met.* II 722-3, the moon alone at Bacch. 9, 27 ff., Pompon. 74, Ov. *Ep.* 17, 71-3, Sen. *Med.* 96-8, *Phaed.* 743-8, Sil. XVI 35. Hesperus/Lucifer: *Th.* VI 580-1 *clarior omnia supra Hesperos exsertat radios*, Pind. *Isthm.* 4, 40-1, Sil. VII 639-40 (Lucifer).

It is clear that Menander draws on poetry when he advises to employ this comparison: ὅτι γένει πάντων κρείττων ἐστὶ καθάπερ καὶ ὁ ἥλιος τῶν ἀστέρων δέδεικται (380, 29 ff. *Sp.*), see II 1 *Intr.*

quantum with comparatives and comparative verbs occurs since Livy (*LHSz.* 136-7), *cf.* I 2, 116 *quantum Latonia nymphas/virgo premit quantumque egomet Nereidas exto* (with the same structure as 36-7), *Ach.* I 607-8 *tantum...vincitur...quantum premit.* For *premere* = to surpass, see also *Th.* I 180, VI 34, Sil. XVI 34, *OLD* 17.

minores...faces...alios...ignes: The stars are called *minores* also in Hor. *loc. cit.* and *Epod.* 15, 1-2 *luna...inter minora sidera*, Sen. *Phaed.* 748, Petr. 89, 55, Sil. VII 640, see also I 4, 36-7 *vaga cingitur astris luna et in Oceanum rivi cecidere minores.*

St. emphasizes the splendour with the (common) metaphors *ignis* (*TLL* VII^1 294, 41 ff., Bömer on Ov. *Met.* I 778) and *fax* (*TLL* VI 404, 1 ff., *cf. Silv.* I 6, 88), combined with *clara*, see II 1, 42n. The theme returns in 41-5, see 21-57n.

38-47.: The main praise of Philetus' beauty is its virility: first femininity is denied, then its manliness is stressed (40-1 *torva, virilis, severo*); the whole is compared to Parthenopaeus, and, after mention of the hair, the whole is closed by the comparisons to a Spartan and a competitor in Olympia.

Philetus was at the uncertain age between boy and man (44-5, 71-2). Boys at that age were often praised by the ancients for their beauty (or vituperated for it, because this beauty amounted to proof of their sexual relations with older men). St. may intend '*suspicione muliebris patientiae Philetum eximere*' (Barth, which throws more light on Barth's sexual fears than on St.); but St. may also simply want to stress one of the two possible aspects of Philetus' beauty. But he automatically insists on both femininity and masculinity and the undefined charm of young boys.

The main cause of Sts.' treating Philetus' virile beauty in this way may well be his preference for and ability in handling the theme of the boy/girl. What is left of the Achilleid is mainly concerned with Achilles

as a young girl, e.g. *Ach.* I 337 *ambiguus tenuique latens discrimine sexus.* Parthenopaeus is another instance of Sts.' liking for this theme: St. treats him at length (*Th.* IV 246 ff., VI 550-645, IX 683-907). Throughout St. insists on Parthenopaeus' ambition to be a manly and menacing warrior and the contrast which this makes with his boyish beauty, see Schetter 44-54, Cancik 1965, 58-9, Vessey 1973, 201-2, 218-9, 298-303, esp. 298: 'there is something feminine in the boyish Parthenopaeus'. It can be no coincidence that the main difference with Vergil's Pallas and Lausus lies in Parthenopaeus' extreme youth (Schetter 45 ff.). St. plays somewhat less insistently with the youth, beauty and manly vigour of Crispinus in V 2, 61-3, 110-24. Earinus, finally, the castrated slave of Domitian, offers ample opportunity to praise youthful beauty (III 4, 21-45), *cf.* Vessey 1973, 28-36.

For Sts.' love of ambiguous situations in general, see II 2, 45-9n. For homosexuality and pederasty in Rome, see Gonfroy, Hirschfeld *Ch.* 33, G. Williams 304, 549 ff., Schrijvers 1981, Veyne, esp. 50-4.

Other authors also treat the theme of the young boy and his ambiguous beauty: Hor. *Carm.* II 5, 24 *ambiguo voltu* (with Nisbet-H.), Anacreon 360, 1 ὦ παῖ παρθένιον βλέπων, often in Sen. and Juv. (with moral indignation).

In this passage the text is more corrupt than in most parts of the *Silvae*: 38-9n., 39-40n., 42-3n., also 48-50n. Either something went wrong with one of M's ancestors, or the scribe of M was still less well disposed than usual here.

38-9. femineum vultu decus oraque supra mollis honos: See *Th.* I 107 *igneus...ore vapor.*

For *supra*, 'on', 'in', see Lucr. III 385-6 *supera caput...cecidisse...vestem* (a spider's web), *supra terram*, on the earth, e.g. at Cic. *ND* II 95 (see *OLD* 2b), Sen. *Her.O.* 168 *supra...aggerem*, Plin. *Nat.* XXXVI 26 *Nereides supra delphines sedentes*, see Apul. *Met.* XI 3, 5 *super frontem* (though this may mean 'above', see Griffiths *ad loc.*).

mollis honos: effeminate charm = *femineum decus. Mollis* is sometimes a term for passive homosexual behaviour, see *TLL* VIII 1379, 26 ff., Veyne 52, Schrijvers 1981, 26, and *mollire*, to castrate, at III 4, 68, Luc. X 133-4, Claud. *Eutr.* I 48.

For *honos*, charm, beauty (*pulchritudo*: Lact. Plac. on *Th.* II 160), see e.g. II 1, 17-8, I 2, 113, III 4, 10, IV 5, 1, Mulder on *Th.* II 160, Vollm. on I 3, 10, II 3, 64-5n.

39-40. qualis dubiae post crimina formae de sexu transire iubent: The general sense is clear: Philetus had not the effeminate beauty of a eunuch. But the text is problematic. As it stands it means 'as of those

whom men make change their sex by the crime which makes their appearance ambiguous'.

Castration is called *crimina* because Domitian issued an edict forbidding it, probably in 83, see III 4, 74-5 *nunc frangere sexum atque hominem mutare nefas*, IV 3, 13-5 *fortem vetat interire sexum et censor prohibet mares adultos pulchrae supplicium timere formae*, Mart. II 60, VI 2, Suet. *Dom.* 7, 1, Dio LXVII 2, Vollm. on III 4, 65, Gsell 84, Fr. 123 n. 2.

dubiae formae is best taken as a free use of the gen., the crime resulting in, as Vollm. and Fr. do (though IV 3, 15 and Sen. *Dial.* I 3, 13 *exsectae virilitatis vel dubiae*, which Fr. quotes for support, are irrelevant). Mozl. translates 'after the reproach of fading beauty', which is strange, esp. where his rendering of *dubiae* is concerned. Traglia-Ar. imply that ambiguous beauty was an incitement to castrate boys ('*dopo le colpe di un'ambigua bellezza*'). But a reference to Domitian's edict seems to be necessary. For *dubius* in this sense, see also *Ach.* I 744 *dubia facies suspecta figura, Anth.Lat.* 108, 4 *et dubii pulcher corporis errat homo*, 109, 4 *ut dubites quid sit, vir magis an mulier.*

For *iubere* in this weakened sense, see esp. III 4, 69-71 *iuvenis Phoebeius* (= Aesculapius) ...*corpus/de sexu transire iubet*, Calp. *Ecl.* 6, 88 *quo vos insania tendere iussit*, Sen. *Her.O.* 1688 *ipsa quam sexus iubet maerere, OLD* 6b.

The difficulties lie in *qualis, post* and *iubent*: *qualis* is supposed to be acc. plur. by all edd. who print this text (everyone after Baehrens, except for Saenger and Clouard). It stands for *ut talibus est quos.* The subject of *iubent* is general, 'people'. *Post*, according to Vollm., is causal, and this seems to be what Fr. means too, by referring to *Dig.* 39, 5, 31, 4, *ratae donationes esse non possunt post crimen perduellionis contractum.* Each of these assumptions is difficult in itself, and the combination of them suggests that the text is corrupt.

Vollm. refers to V *Praef.* 8 and Juv. 2, 62 for causal *post.* But that there and elsewhere *post hoc* or *post haec* can mean '*post* and therefore *propter*' does not go far to prove that *post* is causal here. What is more, Vollm. contradicts himself when he explains *post* as '*darum*' (V *Praef.* 8) and states 'die *dubia forma* bringt man durch die *crimina* hervor' (here).

If the explanation of *dubiae* ... *crimina formae* (above) is right (as Vollm. and Fr. think), *post* should rather be (or mean) *per.* And this is what Kl. suggested (*app.*): ꝑ has become p´. This is a simple and attractive solution. Fr. defends *post* here by referring to III 1, 42-3 *qualemque vagae post crimina noctis Thespius obstupuit.* But *post* has a different shade of meaning there, and *qualem* is easier than *qualis* here, esp. since *quem...detinuit* precedes (40-2).

If *crimina formae*, on the other hand, means 'the crime of possessing beauty', *post* remains strange.

The conjecture *discrimina* is ascribed to Markl. and Bentley (Haupt 1876, 132, Havet 269), but first made by Peyrarède (1658). *Discrimen* in a similar context occurs also at Hor. *Carm.* II 5, 23 *discrimen obscurum solutis crinibus ambiguoque voltu, Ach.* I 337. Markl. explains *discrimina* by saying: "*notum enim pueros formosissimos in hanc rem eligi solitos*". Clouard, who, like Saenger, prints it, translates '*dont le caractère* (!) *incertain est une trahison à l'égard du sexe*'. Neither of these explanations makes the phrase *discrimina formae* clear.

There is one other interesting conjecture: Baehrens' *quos* for *post.* The sentence then runs *honos qualis* (*eis est*) *dubiae quos crimina formae...iubent*[4]. This has the great advantage of giving *iubent* a subject (*crimina*). *Qualis* is also easier here. For the position of *quos*, see II 2, 127 *dubio quem non in turbine rerum*, III 2, 42, 104, 119, *cf.* II 3, 10n. But *qualis...quos* is harsh. In *OLD* B 5c there is no instance of *qualis* followed by a relative pronoun, but *cf.* (though both with a different construction) Liv. VIII 39 *equitum acies, quales quae esse instructissima potest...caede omnia replet*, Ov. *Met.* X 735-7 *flos...qualem quae lento celant sub cortice granum punica ferre solent.* II 2, 34 *qualis si* is less harsh. On the other hand, of *qualis* in the acc. introducing a clause I have found only one example: III 1, 42 (above), apart from those cases where *qualem* or *qualia* or *quale* (not *qualis*) adapt themselves to a following noun, like III 1, 73-4 *qualem...Saturnia noctem attulit*, Verg. *A.* VI 268-71 *ibant obscuri...quale...est iter.* See *OLD* B 5c.

All in all my conclusion is that Baehrens' *quos* for *post* (not necessarily with his *quali*) mends matters more than Klotz' *per.*

40-1. torvaque virilis gratia: This is in M and unmetrical. Domitius printed *torvoque*, followed by most edd. Others (Phill., Mar.), follow q in printing *torva atque.* This implies putting a colon after *iubent.*

In *torvoque, -que* must be adversative: not effeminate beauty, but manly grace. Adversative *-que* occurs also in 41 and 44, see *LHSz.* 481, Fraenkel 1957, 219 n. 4. The dependent clause *qualis...* makes this interpretation less easy, but not impossible.

But *torva atque* seems superior, because it is easier, but esp. because *torva atque virilis* balances *femineum* (*decus*) and *mollis* (*honos*) in 38-9. Håk. (74 n. 11) claims that *torva atque* is 'stylistically superior' without further comment.

torva atque virilis form almost an oxymoron with *gratia. Torvus* is a word which is especially frequent for warriors (see below on Parthenopaeus), e.g. *Th.* II 716-7 (with Mulder), VIII 707-8, XI 10 (with Venini), *Ach.* I

---

[4] Baehrens also wrote *quali* for *qualis*, by which he presumably meant *honos quali* (*ii sunt*) *quos.*

352, Mar. *Addenda* 152, Aricò 60-1. In 73 below it is said of Nemesis, see also 41-2n.

41-2. nec petulans acies, blandique severo igne oculi: Philetus' gaze was not insolent (*petulans*); he looked gently (*blandi*) and yet gravely (*severo*) out of his eyes.

For the eyes and their splendour (*igne*), see II 1, 42n. and 43n. For *-que*, see on *torvaque* above. For *blandus*: II 1, 45-6n. For *petulans*: II 3, 24-6n., and about the eyes: Petr. 138, 6 *tam petulantibus oculis*. Like Glaucias, Philetus is not *lascivus* (II 1, 75). *Pudor* is also one of his qualities (II 1, 40, below 48), but he is more grave, less childish.

Note the persistent enjambment here, in 43-4 and 44-5 and *cf.* II 1, 153-7n.

The combination of gentleness and earnest or severity is frequent in ancient literature: Calp. *Ecl.* 7, 84, *Laus Pis.* 100-3 *plenus gravitate serena vultus...laeta sed tetricitate decorum* (*habitum*), Sil. VIII 560-1 *flagrabant lumina miti aspectu gratusque inerat visentibus horror*, Mart. V 6, 10, Nemes. *Ecl.* 1, 56-7 *blanda tibi vultu gravitas et mite serena fronte supercilium*, Plin. *Ep.* IX 9, 2 *pari libra gravitas comitasque, Pan.* 4, 6, Aus. *Parent.* 2, 6 and 22, 7. See also *Silv.* I 1, 16, IV 2, 41-2.

42-3. qualis bellis iam casside visu Parthenopaeus erat: Only two scholars have convinced themselves that this reading of M makes sense, Buecheler (in Vollm.) and Marastoni (which in itself strongly suggests that the text is corrupt). This passage has provoked about 18 conjectures, see Håk. 74-7 for a very thorough discussion (with which I agree completely) and Lotito 45-7.

What is clear is that Philetus' appearance is compared to Parthenopaeus'. The *tert. comp.* must be the combination of manly vigour and youthful beauty, see 38-42 and 43-7. The similarity concerns the eyes (41-2) and the hair and blooming cheeks (43-5). The problems lie in the meaningless *iam* and in the kinds of ablatives which *bellis* and *casside* are.

Buecheler explains the text as '*qualis visu iam* (*in*) *bellis* (*ex*) *casside Parthenopaeus erat.* Nec tamen *bellis* pro ablativo habendum est; dicitur P. tum cum bellis iam interfuit cassidem gerens'. This is developed by Mar. (*Addenda* 144-5; he prints *qualis...casside* between commas in the text): '*torvum pugnantibus* (= bellis) *casside* (= abl. causae) *antea opertum et blandum post exemptam cassidem apertum vultum videntibus* (= *visu*)'. Mar. thinks that St. says: 'as P. looked because of his helmet, when he was still in the war' and means 'as P. looked with his helmet on when he was still in the war, and afterwards when he had taken it off'.

Mar. puts his finger on one sore spot: we do not want Parthenopaeus with a helmet on his head. It is no objection that the helmet is a superfluous detail (see II 1, 92-3n., 178-82n., 25-8n. here). But a helmet would completely hide the hair (and Parthenopaeus was on Sts.' mind in 43-5) and the eyes would also be partly hidden: *Th.* VII 491-2 *quanam inveniam...natum...sub galea?*, VIII 448-9 *geminos...occultos galeis*, X 756-7 *Menoecus...exempta manifestus casside nosci*, XI 603 *tractat galeas atque ora latentia quaerit*, see also Sil. XIV 155-65.

St. imitates himself here: in *Th.* IX he describes the aristeia of Parthenopaeus: 699-706 *ast ubi pugna/cassis anhela calet, resoluto vertice nudus/exoritur; tunc dulce comae radiisque trementes/dulce nitent visus, et, quas dolet ipse morari,/nondum mutatae rosea lanugine malae./Nec formae sibi laude placet multumque severis asperat ora minis, sed frontis servat honorem/ira decens.*

Note that *tunc* here means 'after he had taken off his helmet'. In 879-80 St. is at pains to say that Parthenopaeus' helmet was taken off before he mentions his eyes: *cecidit laxata casside vultus, aegraque per trepidos exspirat gratia visus.*

This means that texts where P. occurs with his helmet on are not right. Vollm. has *bellis in casside visu*, Kl. and Mozl. accept Krohn's (in Vollm.) *bellus iam casside visu*, Fr. prints his own *bellus in casside visu*, copied by Sb. With *bellus* Frère's usual sensitivity leaves him: he claims that it *non discrepat cum Silvarum dicendi genere.* However, *bellus* is completely absent from epic and tragedy (except for Lucr. IV 1190, see I 643). It does not occur in Prop., only once in Ov. (*Am.* I 9, 6 *bella puella*, a formula), twice in Tib. St. does not have *bellus* elsewhere. It would be wrong to suppose great differences in sublimity of style between the *Silvae* and the epics, see II 1, 16n. For the vulgarity of *bellus*, see Axelson 35, Delarue 1974 (Latomus), 540 and n. 31, Cancik *Forschungsbericht* § 2. Apart from this, the lengthening of *bellūs* would be without parallel in St., see Håk. 74 and Vollm. 556. Phill. obelizes *bellis...visu.*

Most edd. and critics who make Parthenopaeus battle without his helmet propose something like *casside...missa* (after Domitius, but see Reeve 219 for other humanists who may also have conjectured it): *demissa casside visu* (Saenger), *bellans iam casside missa* (Postg.), *bellis iam casside missa* (Clouard), *bellans cum casside missa* (Traglia). But *missa* is a harsh change from *visu.* Baehrens proposed *liber iam casside* (accepted by Damsté 1923, 153), conferring Mart. IX 56, 7 *casside dum liber Parthenopaeus erat.* This has the merit of making it clear that St. and Mart. refer to one particular battle of Parthenopaeus, *viz.* the one which St. describes in *Th.* IX. But *liber* for *bellis* is a very harsh correction.

Håk. accepts Adrian's *sine* (34) together with Postgate's *bellans*: *bellis* seems to be a perseveration from *qualis* and *bellans* is good, see *Th.* IX 710 (*Parthenopaeum*) *bellantem atque ipso sudore et pulvere gratum.*

The difficulty in Håkanson's *qualis bellans sine casside visu* is the combination of *qualis* and *visu.* In material from *TLL* Håk. has found not more than 5 instances of *talis/qualis* with a limitative addition of any kind: Ov. *Met.* VIII 322 *talis erat cultu*, Vitr. 6, 8, Sen. *Her.F.* 329-30 *et qualis animo est talis incessu venit, Tro.* 464-5 and *Th.* II 170 *tales stirpemque animosque* (the only instance of an acc.). Probably II 7, 84-7 must be added, *qualem...forma*, see also Enn. *Ann.* 222 *qualis consiliis*, Man. III 211 *quanta effectu.* Moreover, if Håkanson's examples must parallel *qualis visu* here, *visu* should mean 'appearance', or 'eyes'. Otherwise it is a supine abl., which is unparalleled (though perhaps not impossible, given the rarity of additions to *talis/qualis*). II 3, 39 *primaevam visu* (note there) may in some respects represent a parallel.

St. has many reminiscences from his own poetry here: *Th.* II 716-7 (*Minervae*) *torva genis horrore decoro cassis*, X 840 and XI 10 *torvus visu*, XII 189 *nunc mitis coniunx, nunc iam sub casside torva*, see V 2, 179-80 *torvaque induceret ora casside.* Perhaps *qualis...visu* is suggested by *torvus visu.*

Summarized: Håkanson's *qualis bellans sine casside visu* seems to be the best proposal made as yet, and it is printed here; but it is not completely convincing.

43-5. simplex...horrore decoro: For *horrore* M has *herrore*, corrected by m. Vollm. is the only ed. to print *errore*, conferring Claud. *Epith. Hon.* 104 ff. *neglectam partem* (of the hair) *studiosa relinquens, plus error decuit* and *Rapt. Pros.* II 21 *errare comas.* But this ruins the typically Statian oxymoron (see also *Th.* II 294-5 *decorum...nefas*); and St. himself has good parallels: *Th.* II 716 (above), VIII 389 *horrore comarum*, X 606, see Quint. *Inst.* X 3, 160. *Horror* is unkemptness, see *TLL* VI^3 2997, 56 ff., II 1, 169-72n. Philetus' hair is *munda sine arte* (Prop. IV 8, 40), simple, as *simplex* in Hor. *Carm.* I 5, 4. The style is different from Glaucias' hairdo (II 1, 43n.), more like Alexander's, see Gaymann 57.

obsessae nondum primoque micantes flore genae: 'Your cheeks, not yet thickly covered, but gleaming with the first down'. In verse-inscriptions it is often said that the boy died at the moment when the first down appeared on his cheeks, see Griessmair 60-1, e.g. Vérilhac 27, 9; 27 B, 4; 130, 3; 167, 5-6. For the beard as a signal of manhood, see II 1, 52-4n. For *-que*, see 40-1n. above.

For *obsessae*, see Sen. *Dial.* II 18, 1 *obsessam saetis cervicem.*

Flos is *lanugo*, the first down, since Pac. *trag.* 362 *opacat flore genas*, see *Th.* V 228, VI 585-7 *iam tenuem pingues florem induxere palaestrae/deserpitque*

genis nec se lanugo fatetur/intonsae sub nube comae, Verg. *A.* VIII 160, Luc. VI 562, *TLL* VI[1] 933, 50-65.

micantes in this connection is typical of St., *cf.* II 1, 36-136n. Usually it means *splendere*, used, for instance, of the eyes (*TLL* VIII 931, 43 ff.; not in St.). Or it has a connotation of menace (*'vibrando fulgere'*: *TLL* VIII 930, 10 ff.). For cheeks or down it is only used at Mart. IV 45, 7-8 *perpetuo sic flore mices, sic denique non sint tam longae Bromio, quam tibi, Phoebe, comae* (see IX 36, 5). St. may be inspired by Mart. here, see on their relationship II 1, 72-5n. (and add Buchheit 1960, 246 n. 3), also II 1, 50-1n.

45-7.: Philetus' boyish virility is emphasized in the two final comparisons, one to a Spartan boy, and one to a youthful athlete who for the first time takes part in the Olympic games.

The Spartan is the prototype of vigour: a wrestler (I 2, 111, *Th.* VI 740-2), swimmer (*Th.* X 496-7, *al.*), discus-thrower (V 3, 53), *cf.* Fr. 194 n. 5.

For the importance of the Olympics, also as a subject for comparisons, see Heuvel on *Th.* I 421 ff., Fortgens on *Th.* VI 5, *Ach.* I 415-7, III 1, 140-1, V 3, 52 and 220 ff.

St. varies in the comparisons by *talis/sic* (24-5n., II 1, 178-82n.), the change of subject/object (*pubem...Eurotas, ...Elin...puer*). The last one is the longest; *pubes* is replaced by the more concrete *puer*, which is furnished with an epithet (*integer aevi*). See 25-8n., 30-3n.

Ledaeo gurgite: 'In the Spartan water'. *Ledaeus* because Leda was Spartan, see Mart. VIII 28, 3, Sil. IV 356; *cf.* I 1, 53, where *Ledaeus* means 'of Leda's son'.

gurges for the water of a river occurs since Catul. 65, 5, see *OLD* 2, Lunderstedt 72, e.g. IV 3, 94, IV 5, 39. See *Th.* X 496-7 *rigidique natator Oebalus Eurotae.*

teneri...integer aevi: *Integer aevi* occurs also at Verg. *A.* II 638, Ov. *Met.* IX 441. It means 'young' (in its first instance, Enn. *scen.* 401 (Joc.), it means 'immortal'). By adding *teneri* St. emphasizes Philetus' youth. For the gen. with *integer*, see *LHSz.* 74, Austin on *A.* II 638, Nisbet-H. on Hor. *Carm.* I 22, 1.

Iovi...approbat annos: 'Commends his years to Jove'. For Jove as the supreme arbiter of the games, see III 1, 140-1, *Th.* I 421, *cf.* Verg. *G.* III 180-1.

For *approbare* in the sense *'efficere ut laudetur'* (*TLL* II 313, 3 ff.), see Sen. *Con.* X 3, 7 *mores tuos patri debes approbare*, Val. Max. VI 3, 10.

48-57. Philetus' character: Like Glaucias, Philetus was pure (II 1, 40n.) and mature for his years (*ibid.* 38-9n.): 48-50. But the main point

of this section of the *laudatio* is the unanimity between Philetus and his master (contrast II 1, 56-66n.): 50-4. This is illustrated by comparisons: 54-7.

48-50. Nam pudor undae notae mentis tranquillaque morum temperies teneroque animus maturior aevo carmine quo potasse queam: This is in M. Lines 48 and 50 are hopelessly corrupt. Even Håk. seems too optimistic here (77-9). A survey of the discussion, together with some arguments, follows here; but line 50 seems beyond repair.

undae is corrected by M[1] and A* into *unde.* Concerning this *unde* critics can be divided into those keeping it (Postg., Kl., Mozl., Fr., Mar.), those who put it into a parenthesis (Vollm.), and those replacing it by a conjecture. The objections against *unde* are: **1)** the sentence must then run *nam unde pudor* (*sit*)...*carmine quo* †*potasse*† *queam? Mentis* and *morum* must both go with *temperies.* This is difficult: *temperies morum* is a much more natural combination, 'a blend of habits, ways', than *mentis* (*et*) *morum temperies,* see Gel. XIX 12, 3 *adfectionum...temperie, OLD* 1. There is no combination of a word similar to *temperies* and *mens* in *TLL* VIII 730, 77-732, 16 (*structurae*)[5]. (Mozl. reads *novae* (M[2]) *menti* = 'his young mind'; Kl. reads *menti* and takes *pudor notae* together). **2)** *Unde pudor notae sit* is supposed to mean 'his shame of criticism' or something like it ('*son appréhension de toute flétrissure*': Fr.), see Håk. 77 n. 16. **3)** St. would be asking 'how can I tell the source of your *pudor*?', instead of, what one would expect, 'how can I describe your *pudor*?' Vollmer's *pudor* (*unde notae?*), 'his *pudor* (from where has he got the signs of it?)', is a strange way of putting an unlikely question and does not help the first difficulty.

Unde notae is probably to be changed into Heinsius' *ingenuae,* as Håk. argues. This is accepted by Markl., Saeng., Phill., Clouard, Sb., Traglia(-Ar.). See Catul. 61, 79, Prop. II 24, 4, Sen. *Dial.* II 15, 1, *Phaed.* 250, Juv. 11, 154 *ingenui vultus puer ingenuique pudoris.* This solution removes all three difficulties and gives excellent sense: *pudor ingenuae mentis* refers to 12, 22-3, *cf.* II 1, 44-5n. It is, however, not very close to the ms.

Unfortunately I think that *nam* is also corrupt, though the only critic who seems to have suspected this at one time is Phill. (Phill.[1]: *iam,* Phill.[2]: *nam*): St. has emphatically concluded his part on beauty with two final comparisons (*cf.* 34-47n.) and now takes an emphatic fresh start for the *mores* with the statement that his forces are not sufficient for this.

---

[5] If *temperies* is 'restraint' here, as in II 2, 153 (n.), the only example for this sense before Claudian, *mentis* (*et*) *morum* is a better combination. But a more cogent reason than that seems necessary for explaining *temperies* in that sense, the more so since *fruendi temperies* (II 2, 152-3) is different as a combination from *mentis* (*et*) *morum temperies.*

There is no connection at all with the preceding lines. Vollm. defends *nam* here and at I *Praef.* 24 by stating that *nam* can be '*fortsetzend*'. That is true, but, as he says, there is always some '*begründender Gedanke*'. This is absent here.

Virtually the only thing which can have been written at the outset of 48 in view of similar turns in St. is not *nam* but *non*: see II 2, 36 ff. (also a fresh start) *non, mihi si cunctos Helicon indulgeat amnes,...innumeras valeam species...Pieriis aequare modis*, IV 2, 7 ff. *qua celebrem mea vota lyra...non si...digna loquar, Th.* XII 797-9 *Non ego...si...dignis conatibus aequem*, see *Silv.* I 2, 43-5, I 4, 128 ff. *nec, si vacuet...sufficiam*, II 1, 10-2, V 4, 11 *unde ego sufficiam? non si, Th.* VI 498-500 *non...ianitor, non...Eumenides vidisse queant*, Ov. *Met.* VIII 533 *non, mihi si...tristia persequerer.*

If *non* is read for *nam*, the result is a statement instead of a question (as in all the other examples quoted above); this forces us to consider *quo* as also corrupt.

For *potasse* solutions are divided into those keeping *queam* who treat the sentence as an anacoluthon, and those who read *queant* for *queam*, after Q[1] (see van Dam 398). The second line of approach is followed by Håk. and others, who accept *patuisse* (Unger, see van Dam *loc. cit.*): 'how can your *pudor* (etc.) be shown in my poem?'. But *carmine patere* sounds strange and *patere* is not found elsewhere in St. in this sense of 'being clear'.

It is probable that the idea of *carmine res aequare* was in the original text, see II 2, 42, V 3, 11 *Martemque aequare canendo* and above. The vulgate's *pensasse* suggests as much. In this context Saftien's *par esse* (in Vollm.) would be good[6]. It is supported by I 1, 17-8 *nec veris maiora putes; par forma decorque, par honor.* For *par* with the abl. (not a common construction), see *LHSz.* 111. But, with *non* for *nam, quo* disappears.

If the anacoluthon is accepted and *queam* is retained, St. speaks in the first person, as he does in the parallels above, *cf.* also I 3, 34 *quid primum mediumve canam, quo fine quiescam?* For anacoluthon, see Vollm. at I 4, 52 ff. If *nam* and *quo* are kept, this leaves open a wide choice for a word replacing *potasse*: *donasse* (Heinsius, see van Dam 398), *dotasse* (Koestlin 1877, 179), *repetisse* (Postg.), *pandisse* (Mar.), to quote only the least improbable ones. But if the idea of *res verbis aequare* is kept and *nam* is replaced by *non*, the sense of the passage demands something like the cacophonous *quoquam aequasse queam* (or *quoquo*, or *quoque*).

Something like *non pudor ingenuae mentis...carminibus par esse queat*, or, alternatively, like *non pudor ingenuae mentis...carmine quoquam aequasse queam* would theoretically give sense to the sentence. But neither the syntax nor

---

6 Saftien proposed to read *par esse queam*, not, as I suggest here, *pudor...temperies... animus...carmine quo par esse queat* (incongruence of predicate and subject, see *LHSz.* 433).

the sound commends these solutions. Moreover, the corruptions seem manifold and deeply hidden. Therefore it seems wise to obelize *quo potasse queam.*

tranquilla...morum temperies: See II 2, 150-4n. for *temperies*; for *morum*, see 21-57n. above.

tenero...animus maturior aevo: See II 1, 40 *probitas maturior aevo* and II 1, 38-9n. (*praecox*; add Ov. *Ars* 185 *ingenium caeleste suis velocius annis*, Pers. 4, 4-5 *ingenium et rerum prudentia velox ante pilos venit*). St. puts less emphasis on the contrast *puer-senex* than in II 1.

50-2. Saepe ille volentem castigabat erum studioque altisque iuvabat consiliis: Like Glaucias, Philetus sometimes did a thing implying reversal of the master-slave relationship, *castigabat erum*, see II 1, 56-66n. (and for masters chastising slaves e.g. Pl. *Mos.* 882, Cic. *Tusc.* III 64). But *volentem* implies that even in that case they were as much one as when Philetus advised Ursus. See *dulci* in II 1, 61 and Mart. IV 42, 11-2 *saepe et nolentem cogat nolitque volentem liberior domino saepe sit ille suo* (what a nice slave-boy should be like).

studioque altisque consiliis means 'with sympathy and penetrating advice', a result of Philetus' *animus maturior.* For *altus*, see *OLD* 14, e.g. *Th.* III 386-7 *altus consiliis pater.*

Philetus is pictured here as a younger, but serious, friend, in contrast with Glaucias, who amuses Melior with his childish pranks.

52-3. tecum tristisque hilarisque: St. says three times over that Ursus and Philetus are one (see above): *tecum, nec...suus, tuo...ab ore* (below). But only here are they represented as really equals: in 50-2 Philetus is master; the expressions in 53 imply his (real) submission to Ursus.

LHSz. say (515) that *-que...-que* is elevated in style in Augustan poetry and afterwards. That may account for its comparative rarity in *Silv.* II: it occurs 11 times in its 775 lines (*cf.* II 1, 220-2n.). In the Aeneid it occurs 152 times, see Norden on *A.* VI 233 and 236. Though II 6 is not particularly lofty in tone, 3 of those 11 instances are found here: in 52, in 67 and in 104.

nec unquam ille suus: *Suus* plays on the implications of **1)** *sui iuris*, a free man, which Philetus was not (see Pl. *Per.* IV 3, 3) and **2)** a separate personality with an independent will, *cf.* Cic. *Fin.* IV 4, 10 *semperque esse in disputando suus. Suus* in the first sense is sometimes used in the contention that nobody is really free, see II 2, 72, Sen. *Ep.* 32, 4 *nemo sibi contigit, Ben.* III 20, 1 *mens...sui iuris.* Buth this thought is not present here.

vultumque tuo sumebat ex ore: Philetus adapted his expression (and his mood) to Ursus'. See V 5, 87 *a nostro veniebant gaudia vultu*, Ov. *Ars* II 202 *imponat leges vultibus illa tuis*, Sen. *Dial.* XI 5, 5 *indue dissimilem*

vultum...et da operam ut fratres...animum ex vultu sumant, Juv. 3, 104 and 9, 9.

54-5. dignus...Haemonium Pyladen praecedere fama Cecropiamque fidem: As a friend of his master Philetus surpassed the most famous friends of mythology. St. alludes in riddles here.

Haemonius Pylades is a contradiction in terms, for Pylades, Orestes' friend, did not come from *Haemonia*, Thessaly (II 1, 88-9n.), but from Phocis. St. employs the expression 'a Pylades' here as 'a true friend'. In the same way he calls Veiento in I 6, 15 Fabius Veiento, meaning simply 'the hesitating Veiento', see Vollm. there, Fr. 83 n. 2, Juv. 5, 59 *Gaetulum Ganymeden*, 16, 26 *quis tam Pylades...ut veniat*, Friedländer on Juv. 1, 61, below 61-2n.

Commentators assume that 'the Thessalian friend' is Patroclus, since Patroclus followed Achilles as loyally as Pylades followed Orestes (Vollm., Fr., Traglia-Ar.). But Patroclus is not called *Haemonius* elsewhere. Achilles, however, is: see 33 above, Prop. III 1, 26, Ov. *Am.* II 9, 7, see *Silv.* II 1, 89, Ov. *Am.* II 1, 32. In *Cecropiam* St. also alludes to the more important one of a pair of friends (below). So St. here suggests a comparison of Philetus to Achilles, not Patroclus. St. disregards the boy's humble status until 55.

The friendship between Orestes and Pylades was proverbial: Cic. *Fin.* II 26, 84, *hac Pyladea amicitia*, Ov. *Rem.* 589, *Tr.* I 5, 21, V 4, 25, Mart. VI 11, 1, VII 24, 3, Otto 1890 n° 1307.

Cecropiam...fidem, the Athenian loyalty, is the friendship between the Athenian Theseus and the Lapith Peirithoos. For *Cecropius*, Athenian, see *Th.* IX 518, XII 163, 726, *OLD* 2. For the proverbial friendship of the two, see Hom. *Od.* XI 630, *RE* XIX 120 ff., *RE Suppl.* XIII 1557 ff., Prop. II 1, 37-8 (with Achilles and Patroclus), Ov. *Tr.* I 3, 66 *Thesea pectora iuncta fide*, IV 10, 78 *inque fide Theseus quilibet esse potest* and much more in Otto 1890 n° 1779.

St. usually puts two pairs of friends together: Theseus/Peirithoos and Orestes/Pylades at *Th.* I 476-7, Orestes/Pylades and Achilles/Patroclus at V 2, 155. Here he gets in three pairs of friends by means of the allusion in *Haemonium Pyladen.*

dignus is always followed by the inf. in St. (since Catul. 68, 131, see *LHSz.* 350), *cf.* Heuvel on *Th.* I 276 (and add I 2, 117, I 3, 96, *Th.* VII 315, XII 499).

et: Is equal to *etiam* here in sense, see II 2, 81-2n.

55-7. laudum terminus esto quem fortuna sinit: At the end of the *laudatio* St. makes clear that Philetus, after all, was only a slave, see II 1,

135-6n. His loyalty is that of the humble Eumaeus to his master (57-8) rather than that of Achilles or Theseus.

laudum terminus: 'the bounds of his excellence', *cf.* Plin. *Ep.* VI 29, 3 *terminos...dignitatis ac verecundiae tuae.* St. says 'he was worthy to surpass heroes, but his status (*fortuna*) does not permit to overstep the limits of praise'. The phrase also implies 'this is the end of the *laudatio*', see II 1, 36n., II 7, 100-4n.

esto: occurs only here in the *Silvae*, 5 times in the epics, *sunto* twice. This is about as often as *esto* occurs in Verg. (10) and Ov. (15). It is equivalent to the unpopular monosyllable *es*, see *LHSz.* 240-1, 757-8.

non mente fidelior aegra speravit tardi reditus Eumaeus Ulixis: Eumaeus (*Eumelus*: M, *Eumaeus*: K[c]QR) is an extremely rare figure in Latin poetry. *Onom.* cites only this line and Aus. *Perioch. Od.* 14, 22 (in prose Varro, Hyginus and Cassiodorus).

Eumaeus' loyalty is stressed by *mente aegra*, anxiously, *speravit*, (not 'he waited', but) he hoped, and *tardi*, however long Odysseus' return took, see II 1, 118, II 7, 49, V 3, 148.

58-70. LAMENTATIO: It consists of laments against the iniquity of fate and gods (58-9, 68-70). These frame the largest section, the praise of Ursus' riches (60-7), which St. skilfully introduces here, see *Intr.*

The *lamentatio* is one of the least independent parts of an *epicedion*: in II 1 it is contained in the *laudatio* (36-136n., *Intr.* II 1), in III 3 it is fused with *descriptio funeris* and *consolatio*, in V 3 it is mixed with *descriptio morbi*, in V 5 it was perhaps part of the *laudatio*, see E.-F. 79-81, 93, 104, 107, 113. I have followed E.-F. (86) in making the *lamentatio* here an independent part, because 58 starts a new section, with the topical lament against divine envy (below) in the characteristic form of the question (II 1 *Intr.*, V 1, 135 ff., the only other independent *lamentatio* in the *Silvae*).

58-9. Quis deus...quisnam...casus...Fatis: For the indignant lament against higher powers, see *Th.* XI 462-3, II 1, 120-4n., II 4, 3n., II 5, 11-3n., 2-6n. above, E.-F. 138 § 32. It is one of the most frequent themes in inscriptions. See for Greek: Vérilhac nos. 141-61; for Latin: Lattimore 154 ff., Pikhaus 62 ff., 118 ff. On the special role of Envy, see 68-70n. and 73-5n. below, II 1, 120-4n.

The three concepts, god, chance, fate, are virtually equivalent here, but the last one is the longest and the most concrete one: *manus*, see II 1, 137-9n., 8-9n. above, II 1, 184-8n.

vulnera casus eligit: For a similar paradox, chance choosing (*casus*: Q, *causas*: M), see Plut. *Cons. Ap.* 104 D ἄσκοπος γὰρ ἡ τύχη...καὶ δεινὴ παρελέσθαι τὰ προπεπονημένα. For *vulnus eligere*, to choose the right spot for

inflicting a wound, *cf.* Sen. *Oed.* 1068 *eligere nescis vulnus*, Heuvel on *Th.* I 259.

Unde manus Fatis tam certa nocendi?: *Certus* with the gerund does not occur elsewhere in St. It is found since Verg., see *LHSz.* 375, Pease on *A.* IV 554.

The question is answered in 68-70: Invidia has sought out the vital spot for the Fates: *certa/gnara dolorum, vulnera eligit/vitalia vidit, nocendi/laedendi.* See V 1, 137-8 *quisnam ligavit Fortunam Invidiamque deus?*

60-1. O quam divitiis...exutus...fortior...fores: How much better would you have borne the loss of your money. This is a variation on the thought 'what use is money now?', see II 1, 162-5. It allows St. to introduce Ursus' wealth, about the only notable thing about him, see *Intr.* under **II.**

fortior...fores...fumante (61): a notable alliteration of *f*, the *insuavissima littera* (Cic. *Orat.* 163, Quint. *Inst.* XII 10, 29). It may suggest grief (or whatever), but it is doubtful if St. attached much importance to it, *cf.* III 1, 169 *lustra habitata feris foedeque latentia profers.*

censu...opimo: *Census* is synonymous with *divitiae*, riches, see I 2, 121-2, II 1, 163, II 2, 151-2. The word does not occur in the epics.

Urse: The address is a device to heighten the pathos, see II 1, 166-8n. No addressee is mentioned so often in *Silv.* II as Ursus: 10 (n.), 15, 61, 94. This, together with the other data on St. and Ursus (*Intr.*), suggests that St. tries very hard to blow life into the poem.

61-8.: Enumeration of Ursus' properties, *cf.* II 2, 107-11n. They were in Locri in Bruttium (62), in Pollentia (now Polenza) in Liguria (63), at an unknown place in Italy (64, see note), on the right bank of the Tiber (64), in Crete and in Cyrene and elsewhere (67-8).

They are enumerated with a view on the catastrophes which could befall them: fire (61-2), flood (63-5) and draught (67-8). Further variation is introduced by connecting the possessions in Italy by *seu*, those elsewhere by *sive...et* and by *mersissent flumina/Thybridis impetus torsisset.*

The riches of Ursus also evoke the thought 'good fortune precedes and invites catastrophe', see II 1, 137-57n., 68-70n. below.

61-2. ructassent dites Vesuvina incendia Locros: This is in M. *Vesuvina incendia* is said metaphorically, fires like the eruption of Vesuvius in 79 (*cf.* 54-5n.), for there is no connection between Locri and Vesuvius. The easiest way to give sense to the Latin is to put *Locros* in the nom., if Locri had vomited fire. Therefore Buecheler conjectured *Locroe* (for other conjectures and more details, see van Dam 399-400).

The only modern editors who do not accept *Locroe* are Postg., who prints Unger's *raptassent*, and Clouard, who keeps the text of M translating *ructassent* as *semer de ruïnes.*

Locroe, however, is a form which does not occur in any Latin manuscript of whatever text. The only nom. form which is met is *Locri* (Cic. *ND* II 6, Verg. *A.* III 399, Liv. XXII 61, 12, Plin. *Nat.* III 74, IV 7 and 27, Front. *Strat.* IV 7, 26). The only occurrence of *Locroe* is a (probable) conjecture in Quint. *Inst.* X 1, 70 (*cf.* Neue-W. index under *Locrus*), but that is a catalogue of Greek names. St. could have used a Greek form (though he does not do so without reason), *cf.* Vollm. on I *Praef.* 18. But it seems unwise to introduce it into Latin here.

Markland's *Locri* is much more plausible as a form, and not inferior palaeographically: *Locros* could be an anticipation of *Pollentinos*, or the *s* may have been provoked by *dites.* Frère 1943 gives no instances of the interchange *e*/*s*.

For *ructassent*, see Sil. VIII 669 *ructat cadavera fumans Aufidus*, Lucr. III 1012 *eructans aestus*, Sil. XIV 56-8 *Aetna eructat...ignis.* Like *fumante ruina* (in smoking ruin), it paints a scene.

The eruption of Vesuvius inspired writers and poets: Sts.' father planned a poem on it, *cf.* V 3, 205 ff. St. himself mentions it at III 5, 72, IV 4, 79, IV 8, 5, see VFl. III 208-9, IV 507 ff., Sil. VIII 653 ff., XII 152 ff., XVII 592-4.

For the expression, *cf.* V 3, 205 *Vesuvina incendia*, Plin. *Ep.* VI 16, 13 *e Vesuvio monte...flammae altaque incendia.*

dites...Locri: this is the only indication that Locri was still opulent in this time (see *RE* XIII^2 1342) and it does not carry much weight. For *dites*, see *divitiis* in 60.

St. metonymically mentions the place for Ursus' possession there, *cf.* I 3, 1 *Tibur*, IV 4, 85, II 2, 92-3n., Lunderstedt 44.

63. Pollentinos...saltus: Pasture-land. Pollentia was famous for its black wool: Sil. VIII 597, Mart. XIV 157.

64-5. seu Lucanus ager seu Thybridis impetus altas in dextrum torsisset aquas: Thus M. The reading *ager* forces us to assume an impossible ellipsis like (*mersus esset*) or alternatively (*aquas admisisset*). Therefore Heinsius changed *ager* into *Acir* (apparently unknown to Markl.; ascribed to Madvig by Baehrens and Vollm.). It is accepted by all editors since Klotz, except for Clouard, who keeps *ager* and translates as if it was *agrum*, *'les bois de Pollente ou les champs de Lucanie'.*

The Acir is a river in Lucania, which flows into the sea near Heraclea, see *RE* I 1170. But the form *Acir* is highly suspect: it is called Ἄκιρις in

Greek (Strabo VI 1, 14; the acc. Ἄχιριν occurs 4 times in *IG* XIV 645)[7]. It is mentioned only once in Latin, in Plin. *Nat.* III 97, the acc. *Acirim* (*Agirim, Acrim*: codd., see *TLL* I 416, 34-8). This presupposes the same nom. form as in Greek, *Aciris*, not *Acir.* And there seems to be small reason to coin a Latin form *Acir* for this Greek river.

There is only one remote parallel for doublets like *Acir*/*Aciris*: in Vergil's time the usual word for the Saône, *Arar*, seems to have had a doublet *Araris*, see *Ecl.* 1, 63 *Ararim* and Prisc. II 149 f. Keil. But this nom. form *Araris* occurs only in Claudian and laters, see *TLL* II 397, 2 ff., Lévy at Claud. *In Ruf.* II 111. The normal Greek form is Ἄραρ, see *RE* II 379-80.

Other objections against *Acir* are that *-ir* is a most unpopular ending in Latin (only *vir*). *Lucanus Acir* seems also too explicit, both for St. in general and in this context. It is not so much the name of a river which might be expected here, as a synonym for 'river'.

Several lines of emendation seem possible. But I think that a gloss has crept into the text, either with *Lucanus*, or with *ager*, and I obelize both words.

Thybridis impetus: the Greek form *Thybris* is almost universal in Latin poetry (not in satire and hendecasyllables, except for St.: I 6, 100, II 7, 45). Vergil is the first to use it (*A.* II 782 with Austin's note). Both he and Ov. sometimes employ the Latin form *Tiberis*, which alone is used by Hor. and Prop. St., like the other post-Ovidian poets (with the exception mentioned above; in St. IV 3, 112 *Tiberim*), has disposed of *Tiberis.* See Meister 53-7.

For the frequency and impact of the inundations of the Tiber, see Nisbet-H. on Hor. *Carm.* I 2, 13-4 *Tiberim retortis...undis* (18-9 *sinistra labitur ripa*), Plin. *Nat.* III 55, *2 RE* VI 800-2.

altas in dextrum torsisset aquas: 'had swung its swollen waters to the right'.

65-6. paterere serena fronte deos: For *paterere*, see II 1, 48-9n. On the alternation of pluperf. and imperf., see II 1, 113-9n., II 4, 7-8n. (though here a difference seems to be made by St. too). The contrast of *serena* with the catastrophes in 61-5 and 66-8 marks this phrase as the central thought.

For *serena fronte*, 'with equanimity', see I 3, 91-2 *serena fronte*, II 1, 43n., II 2, 147-9n., Verg. *A.* XI 238 *laeta fronte.*

66-8. fidem messisque negasset Cretaque Cyreneque: *Fidem messisque* is a hendiadys, the due harvests.

[7] Fr. (*app.*) is wrong in stating '*scil.* Ἄχρις'. There is no such form in Greek for this river. It is called Ἄχιρις or Κῖρις (Lycophr. 946, *Et. M.* 209, 34).

Creta and Cyrenaica were made into one province under the Republic. The Romans developed agriculture engergetically in these regions, and corn was Cyrenaica's main export. Apparently Ursus had possessions here; we know next to nothing of colonists in Crete and Cyrene: apart from Ursus, only one inscriptional source seems to exist, see *CAH* XI 659-65, 671-3, *RE* XII 168.

For *-que...-que*, see II 1, 120n., 52-3n. above.

et qua tibi cumque beato larga redit Fortuna sinu: 'And wherever lavish Fortune returns to you with well-filled bosom'. St. suggests that Ursus is master over great parts of the world. Trimalchio's boasts in Petr. 48, 3 and 53 are almost a comment on this passage (e.g. *nunc coniungere agellis Siciliam volo*).

Fortuna is one of the most ubiquitous figures in Roman literature and art, see *RE* VII 12 ff., Roscher I 1505 ff., esp. 1529, Plin. *Nat.* II 22 *toto quippe mundo et omnibus locis omnibusque horis omnium vocibus Fortuna sola invocatur.* In literature she occurs mainly in her negative role, as fickle and cruel, *cf.* E.-F. 138 § 32, Plin. *loc. cit.* In Carter the great majority of the adjectives with Fortuna is negative. Here she occurs in her beneficent role: she is pictured as a woman with her *sinus* full of gifts. Elsewhere she is generally portrayed with a cornucopia (Trimalchio has one such picture of Fortuna in the vestibule: Petr. 29), corn-eaves and *modius.* For *larga*, see *blanda* in III 3, 157, *laeta* in Ov. *Tr.* V 8, 17, *CIL* VI 30132, *prospera* in Hor. *Carm.* IV 14, 37. See also 6-8n.

qua tibi cumque: The tmesis of *quicumque* with the weak personal pronoun is not uncommon: Cic. *De Orat.* III 60, Verg. *A.* I 610, VIII 74, Hor. *Carm.* I 7, 25, Ov. *Tr.* II 78, Mart. II 61, 6 *nomen quod tibi cumque datur*: *LHSz.* 474-5.

68-70. Sed gnara dolorum Invidia infelix: Fortuna and Invidia/Nemesis (73-5n.) are often coupled, with the age-old thought that fortune attracts misfortune, *cf.* 58-9n. above, V 1, 138 ff. *nullamne notabit illa* (Fortune) *domum quam non haec* (Envy) *lumine figat protinus et saeva proturbet gaudia dextra? Florebant...penates...Invenere viam liventia Fata, Epic. Drusi* 51 ff., E.-F. 138 § 32, II 1, 137-57n. They are juxtaposed by *beato sinu*/*infelix.*

Invidia: St. is rather fond of the personification of Envy, see also II 1, 120-4n., 77 below, IV 8, 17. The only sustained example of this personification in Latin literature seems to be Ov. *Met.* II 760-832, see Bömer there. The personification is not unknown elsewhere, but it is generally short and not very strong, e.g. Cic. *ND* III 44, Prop. II 17, 11. She is *gnara dolorum*, knows what hurts most, *cf.* Ov. *Met.* II 778 *risus abest, nisi quem visi movere dolores*, 805-6 *quibus* (Envy's doings) *irritata dolore*

Cecropis...mordetur. She brings disaster, *infelix,* see Verg. *G.* III 37 *Invidia infelix* and Ov. 791-2 *quacumque ingreditur florentia proterit arva exuritque herbas et summa cacumina carpit.* And she has the evil eye, whatever she sees is doomed: *vidit,* see V 1, 140 above. The wordplay on *Invidia/vidit* (see also on 76-7 *videndo...invidia*) is also found in Ovid: 770, 772, 778, esp. 780 *sed videt ingratos intabescitque videndo.*

For *vidit,* see also Vérilhac no. 17 (3rd cent. A.D.) σκεφθέντ' ὑπὸ Μοίρης (the dead boy), *cf.* 27, 82 and her commentary '*l'évocation du regard de la Moire...inhabituelle dans la poésie funéraire*'.

animi vitalia: 'The vital spot in the heart'. Elsewhere *vitalia* is always put together with a concrete part of the body: *Th.* VIII 525 *iuguli vitalia* (Plin. *Nat.* VIII 20 *vitalia capitis,* Sil. X 231 *laevae...vitalia mammae*), I 610 *manus vitalibus haeret* (Luc. VII 620, IX 743). See *OLD* 3 'parts of the body indispensable to life, vital parts'. St. may have Ov. *Met.* II 828 in mind here, *vitalesque vias et respiramina clausit* (*letalis hiems*).

laedendi...vias: The gerund with *via* occurs since Pl., see *LHSz.* 375. See *Th.* II 554-5 *medendi...via,* 558 *via prona nocendi,* V 3, 101 *fandi via.*

It may be a little arbitrary to end the *lamentatio* here. But this is certainly one of the most notable sense-pauses in the middle of a line in the *Silvae,* see I 2, 140 (where a speech ends), I 3, 57 (like II 2, 72), II 1, 153-7n., III 3, 182 (where a speech begins), III 5, 18, V 3, 252.

70-85. DESCRIPTIO MORBI AC MORTIS: The description has three parts: the illness, couched in the mythological metaphor of Nemesis attacking the boy (73-9); the moment of dying (79-81); and the sorrow after Philetus' death (82-5). The description of the illness is introduced by mentioning the boy's age, which, in fact, belongs to the theme of the illness itself. A comma after *lustris* (72), instead of the usual full stop, would make this connection clear.

I take this description to begin at 70, because elsewhere the description begins also with a mythological figure which attacks: II 1, 137-57n., V 1, 150 ff. This first part is actually a substitute for a description of growing up and education (see *Intr.*, II 1, 106 ff.). St. combines this with the *topos* of Envy, *cf.* II 1, 120-4n.

The description of dying is kept very short and general. No mention of Ursus' presence is made; contrast II 1, 148 ff., see *Intr.* and on 80-2 below.

The grief after death reminds of the central paradox of II 1 (*Intr.* there). It also recalls 1-10 here. At the end *funera* (84) leads over smoothly to the *descriptio funeris.*

70-2. vitae modo carmen adultae nectere temptabat...cum tribus Eleis unam trieterida lustris: This is in M. Even the meaningless

carmen has found its defenders: Imhof (22) and Krohn (in Vollm.) explain it as 'poem', either as '*omen infaustissimum*' (Imhof), or as 'my poem' (Krohn). In both cases it is an apposition to the sentence as a whole. Poliziano (1978) and Ellis (1885, 89) explain it as 'thread'. *Carminare* is a rare technical word for carding wool. But *carmen* as 'thread' occurs perhaps twice in Latin, Claud. *Eutr.* II 458 and Venant. Fort. *Carm.* 5, 6, see *TLL* III 474, 4-11. In neither case this meaning is certain.

For the corrupt *carmen* a great amount of conjectures has been made. The most popular one is *germen*, accepted by Saeng. (who claims it), Kl., Phill., Fr., Sb., Traglia(-Ar.). Gronovius proposed it, see van Dam 400-2 (also for wrong ascription or ignorance of other conjectures). Its main commendation is that Gronovius did also propose it at Cic. *Fin.* V 43, which then reads *virtutis quasi germen. Germen* in a metaphorical sense does not occur elsewhere in St. *CE* 403, 2 *bis...senos primaevi germinis annos*, which is sometimes quoted to support *germen* here, is different.

A whole group of other conjectures shares a drawback with *germen*, namely that *vitae modo germen adultae* must be either an apposition (to *iuvenum pulcherrimus ille* or to the whole sentence), or a sentence in itself: *culmen* (Gruterus), *crimen* (Scaliger), *limen* (Salmasius), *carcer* (Marastoni, who takes this in the sense of *limen*; presumably he prefers *carcer* because it shares four letters with *carmen* and *limen* only three, see van Dam n. 61).

It seems that a word is needed which makes the sentence run on. Here also many proposals have been made: *compos* and *stamine* (anon., see van Dam n. 62), *cardine* (Gronovius), *limine* (Markland, using Salmasius), *margine* (Håkanson, in a personal letter). Of these *compos* and *stamine* seem the least attractive ones: *compos* does not occur elsewhere in St., and *compos vitae* has no good parallel in Latin, see *TLL* III 2137, 27 ff. *Stamen vitae* also sounds strange (St. always employs the plural of *stamen* in the nom./acc., and he never adds an adj. or gen.); *stamen vitae adultae* is more than strange.

Cardine is printed by Rinn, Vollm., Postg., Mozl. and Clouard. But *cardine vitae* means not 'the beginning of life', but 'death': Sen. *Tro.* 52, Luc. VII 381, Sil. IX 140.

Margine is very good palaeographically (metathesis). But even the literal meaning 'threshold' seems to be restricted to St. (*Th.* X 49, *Silv.* IV 4, 54 *in margine templi*), see *TLL* VIII 394, 30. To postulate a metaphorical sense here, seems daring, in spite of two other strange uses of *margo* in St., see II 1, 43n. *TLL* (VIII 395, 51-5) gives only three instances of a metaphorical use of *margo*, all in a sense different from the one needed here, two Christian ones and one from the scholia on Juvenal.

Though *limine* is more difficult to account for palaeographically, the parallels are good, see II 1, 38-9n., esp. II 1, 38 *in limine vitae* for 12 year-old Glaucias (add VFl. I 823 *primo...sub limine rerum*, III 679 *virtus et spes in limine primo*). If a scribe overlooked or corrupted *li*, a second scribe might put anything in its place. The only one to print *limine* is Baehrens. It is not found in the *apparatus* of Fr., Mar. and Traglia(-Ar.).

I accept *limine.* The phrase then runs: 'the young man, on the threshold of adult life, just tried to join the third of three years to twelve; but Nemesis...'

nectere...cum tribus Eleis unam trieterida lustris: A circumlocution for age is common, *cf.* II 1, 124-5, III 3, 146, V 3, 253-4 *trinisque decem quinquennia lustris iuncta* (71 *nectere*), see E.-F. 104 § 37, e.g. Ov. *Tr.* IV 10, 77-8, Mart. V 34, 5-6 *impletura fuit sextae modo frigora brumae*, most poems in Ausonius' *Parentalia*, Vérilhac 109 A, 113, 115, 133, *al.*

Eleum lustrum means 'four years', one Olympiad. *Lustrum* mostly refers to a period of 5 years, see *OLD* 1a, 2a, 3a. For the word as meaning 4 years, or any period between two leap-years, see *OLD* 3b, III 1, 45 *annua veloci peragunt certamina lustro.* St. generally describes games which take place once in 4 years with *lustrum*: II 2, 6, III 5, 92, IV 2, 62, *cf.* Mart. IV 45, 3. But this does not prove that *lustrum* there means either 4 or 5 years.

Fr. contends that St. means 5 years here (84 n. 1), and that this proves that one Olympiad is reckoned as 5 years at Ov. *Tr.* IV 10, 95 (*cf.* IV 8, 33, *Ib.* 1), Mart. VII 40, 6 (*ter senas Olympiadas* = *Silv.* III 3, 146 *bis octonis lustris*). But, as he says, Mart. VI 85, 5 computes one Olympiad as 4 years, *cf.* Aus. *Epitaph.* 26, 16, where *duodeviginti Olympiadas* = 72 years.

When one Olympiad is put at 5 years, Philetus is in his 18th year here (as Barth already thought). This is certainly too old: it contradicts the general description of Philetus, esp. 44-5 *primo flore micantes genas*, see Aus. *Epitaph.* 35 (almost an extract from II 6, with the name from II 1) *laeta bis octono tibi iam sub consule pubes cingebat teneras, Glaucia adulte, genas et iam desieras puer an puella videri* (see 23 and 49 here). If the boy had been 18, the whole point of the comparison with Parthenopaeus and 45 ff. would be destroyed. Thus Crispinus is already made a *tribunus militum* at 16 and Achilles went to Troy at this age.

Therefore I take *Eleum lustrum* as 4 years, and Philetus' age as 15, together with Markl., Vollm., Mozl. and Traglia-Ar.

For *nectere*, see V 3, 254 (above) *iuncta* = Mart. IX 84, 9. Perhaps St. alludes to the thread of life (e.g. I 4, 123 *nectite...fila Sorores*). The lexica do not give *nectere* in connection with age, but see Aus. *lib.* XXIII 2, 2 (Prete p. 212) *undecies unamque super trieterida necte.*

trieteris is first found at Cic. *ND* III 58, in its technical Greek sense, 'a feast which takes place every two years'. After Cic. it does not occur before St. and Mart.: *Th.* IV 722, VII 93, IX 480, *Ach.* I 595, Mart. IX 84, 9, *al.* Though it may mean simply 'a period of 3 years' (Mart. VI 38, 1, X 53, 3 *invida quem Lachesis raptum trieteride nona*, Aus. *Caes.* 2, 3, Sid. *Ep.* 2, 8 *carm.* vss. 12-3), St. seems to use it only in a solemn context.

iuvenum pulcherrimus ille: *Cf.* Ov. *Met.* IV 55 *Pyramus et Thisbe iuvenum pulcherrimus alter, Epic. Drusi* 301 *iuvenum fortissimus alter.*

72-5. Rhamnusia: Nemesis. She is called after her cult and temple in Attic Rhamnus (Paus. I 33, 2, Plin. *Nat.* XXXVI 17, *RE* XVI 2346 ff., *2 RE* I 140, Bömer on Ov. *Met.* III 406). Since Catul. 64, 395 this epithet is virtually compulsory, e.g. III 5, 5, Ov. *Tr.* V 8, 9, *Ciris* 228 (also as *Rhamnusis* or *Rhamnusias*, see Bömer).

Already in her oldest form, as a goddess of Fate more active than Tyche, she is an enemy to happiness: Herod. I 34 ἔλαβε...Νέμεσις Κροῖσον...ὅτι ἐνόμισε ἑωυτὸν εἶναι ἀνθρώπων ἁπάντων ὀλβιώτατον, see Roscher *Lex.* III 117 ff., 135 ff. Here she is almost equal to Invidia in 68 ff.: she observes the boy (*attendit*), as Invidia does at V 1, 139 (see 68-70n. above). She makes him strong and tall (74-5); compare Invidia's doings at II 1, 121 ff. (120-4n.). She is fused with Fortuna at *CIL* III 1125, Amm. Marc. XIV 11, 25, see Roscher *Lex.* III 138, *CE* 472 *invida Parcarum semper sic prona voluntas.* She is *tristis*, more or less the same as *infelix* in 69, see II 1, 18n.

torvo...vultu: For *torvo*, see 40-1n., and for its etymology, see Burger 222 ff. *Cf.* III 5, 5 *infesto...Rhamnusia vultu.*

implevitque toros oculisque nitorem addidit ac solito sublimius ora levavit: She made his muscles strong and made his eyes shine and made him taller than the other boys of his age.

For *toros implere*, see Cels. I 3 *implet corpus modica exercitatio, extenuat corpus aqua calida*, V 24, 3, *OLD* 3b.

For *nitor*, see II 2, 9-10n.; and for the boy's eyes: 41-2 above.

ora levavit implies rapid growth, *cf.* II 1, 106-9, 126, but also self-consciousness, *cf.* VFl. III 262-3 and for the ending Luc. VI 719. *Sublimius* also suggests more than mere tallness, *cf.* II 1, 191-3n., III 3, 111 *sublime genus.* A similar combination of height, pride and (possible) high birth (10-2n.) occurs at *Th.* II 385, V 699.

solito: see III 2, 77 *solito tunc peior Orion, Th.* VI 427, IX 33, 225, X 757, *Ach.* I 838, Ov. *Ars* II 411, *OLD solitus* 2a.

76-9. heu! misero letale favens: By giving her favours she kills the unhappy boy, for she is jealous of the talents which she herself has dealt

out, see II 1, 120-4n. (*comere*) and below. For *letale favens*, see II 1, 222-6n.

seseque videndo torsit et invidia mortemque amplexa iacenti iniecit nexus: She tormented herself by looking at the result of her own doings. See Ov. *Met.* II 780-1 *intabescitque videndo suppliciumque suum est* (*Invidia*) and 68-70n. above. Vollm. quotes Sen. *Her.F.* 97-8 *suumque lambens sanguinem Impietas...et in se semper armatus Furor.*

As Håk. says (79, see van Dam 401), the syntactic variation in *videndo...et invidia* is extremely harsh (kept by Vollm., Postg., Mozl., Clouard, Fr., Mar. and Saeng., who reads *se namque*). However, both words must be kept because of the word-play (see also Lucr. I 321 *invida...natura videndi*) and *torsit* goes with it naturally, see Hor. *Ep.* I 2, 37 *invidia vel amore...torquebere, Silv.* I 5, 18 *visu Satyros torquetis.* Kl. and Sb. accept Pontanus' *invidiam* (van Dam 401), presumably taken together with *mortemque* as the object of *amplexa*, see below. Phill. obelizes *Invidia Mortemque amplexa.*

Three choices seem to lie open: *ad invidiam* (Schwartz 1889, 11), *ab invidia* (Baehrens) or *ob invidiam* (Traglia). *Ad invidiam* seems improbable, for it implies that Envy was not yet envious when she tormented herself by looking, see also Prud. *Ham.* 553-4 *omne malum mundique hominumque maligni hostis ad invidiam detorqueo. Supplicium...suum* in Ovid also implies *ob* or *ab.*

Traglia gives no reason why he prefers *ob* to *ab.* At first sight there is nothing to choose between them: both prepositions (can) have a causal force; for *ob*, see *LHSz.* 239. Causal *ab* is frequent in poetry, esp. in Ovid, see *TLL* I 33, 36-34, 34, e.g. *Th.* V 431, 546, Ov. *Met.* I 66, II 602, *Tr.* IV 5, 3. The two words, *ob* and *ab*, approach each other in sense, see Cic. *Tusc.* III 52 *ob duas causas* and Sen. *Cl.* I 20, 1 *a duabus causis* and *LHSz.* 257.

Ob invidiam occurs at Verg. *A.* XI 539 *pulsus ob invidiam regno virisque superbis...Metabus*, but the sense of that passage is different. *Ab* seems to be preferable for the following reason: *ob* is in general avoided in poetry. Vergil is the exception in using it 17 times. It does not occur in Catul. and VFl., once in Hor. lyr., Tib. and Luc., 3 times in Prop., 4 times in Sen. trag., 6 in Sil. Ov. has no instance of *ob* in *Am., Ep., Ars, Rem., Med.*, one instance in *Met.* and 7 in the rest of his work together. See Axelson 78-9. St. has only one *ob*, at *Th.* III 207.

So *ab invidia* seems more probable than *ob invidiam.*

The next problem is *mortem...amplexa...iniecit nexus.* Fr. defends this text (which he, Kl., Clouard, Mar. and Sb. print) by explaining *amplexa* '*dans un sens tout intellectuel*' and translating it as '*avec le mauvais œil et la mort*

en tête' (84 n. 3, where he suggests as an alternative: 'giving the kiss of death')[8]. Merrill translates as 'and joined Death to herself'.

But, as Håk. says (80), Nemesis literally embraces the boy and this is said both in *amplexa* and in *nexus*. Vollm. and Mozl. follow Ellis (1885, 89, see van Dam 402) in reading *nexu*; *mortem inecit nexu* should then mean 'she threw death upon him by her embrace'. Most other conjectures are less likely: *invitam Mortem complexa* (Markl.), *at inde avidos artum complexa iacenti iniecit nexus* (Sandström 23), *iuvenemque amplexa* (Saeng.).

But I agree with Håk. that *mortem iniecit nexu* sounds much less probable than Baehrens' *mortisque amplexa iacenti inecit nexus*, printed by Postg. The *nexus mortis* are the chains (or nets) of death, see V 1, 155-6 *furvae miseram circum undique leti vallavere plagae*, Hor. *Carm.* III 24, 8 *mortis laqueis*, Prud. *Carm.* 11, 47 *mortis catenam.*

For *nexus* as 'chains', see *Th.* XI 624-6 *quos nexus fratrum...solvite quaeso manus infestaque vincula...dividite, Ach.* I 209, Ov. *Met.* IX 58.

For the gen. *mortis*, 'of death, bringing death', see *Th.* XI 628-9 *mortis...telum...quaerebat*, Cic. *Clu.* 31 *exhausto...poculo mortis*, Verg. *A.* XII 603 *nodum informis leti.*

So I read *seseque videndo torsit ab invidia mortisque amplexa iacenti iniecit nexus*, after Håk., and explain as 'she tortured herself with envy at the sight and embraced the sick boy, thereby throwing the chains of death upon him'.

For *iacenti*, see II 1, 153-7n.

carpsitque immitis adunca ora verenda manu: For the detail of Nemesis' claws, see II 1, 137-9, Luc. VI 541-3, 565 ff. St. alludes to the *topos* of *integritas* in death, see II 1, 153-7n. Perhaps Philetus was mutilated by illness when he died (the *ed. Bipontina* claims that he died of smallpox).

For *carpere*, see V 1, 150 *carpitur eximium...Priscilla decorem, Th.* IV 511, Cic. *De Orat.* III 190, Luc. VI 551, Apul. *Met.* IX 19. Perhaps Ov. *Met.* II 781 *carpitque et carpitur una* (*Invidia*) is still subconsciously present in Sts.' mind.

Unca manus occurs frequently in St. and elsewhere (see Mulder on *Th.* II 565). *Adunca manus* is only in Verg. *G.* II 165-6.

For *verenda*, see II 1, 136 *verecundo decori.*

79-80. Quinta vix Phosphoros hora rorantem sternebat equum: *Phosphoros* and *rorantem* refer to the morning dew, see *Th.* II 135-6 *Aurora...rorantis excussa comas*, VI 238-9, *roscida dimiserat astra Lucifer*, XII

---

[8] For this 'intellectual sense' of *amplecti* Fr. refers to Hor. *Carm.* III 29, 42 *amplecti* = *cogitare*. This seems to be an error for Hor. *S.* I 2, 53 (the only place where *amplecti* occurs in a non-literal sense in Hor.) *hoc se amplectitur uno*, where *amplectitur* means *sibi placet.*

307, *Ach.* I 242-3 *Titan rorantes evolvit equos*, II 4 *rorantem lampada*, Ov. *Am.* I 6, 65 *pruinosus Lucifer, Epic. Drusi* 281-2 *Aurora...croceis roscida...equis*, Claud. *Carm.* 44, 2-4 *anhelis...equis...rorant...curru*, Bardon 1946, 105-6, 110. But that the morning dew and the morning star are still there at the fifth hour of the day is impossible (thus Vollm., Marastoni 1959, 449 and *Addenda* 146)[9]. Moreover, we expect a reference to the day on which Philetus died, see II 1, 146-7n.

Vollm. wrote *ora* for *hora* (accepted by Kl., Fr., Mar., Sb.): '*Der Sonnenwagen beginnt seine Fahrt* (*zum fünften Male*) *am Saume der Welt; dieser Saum lässt sich vergleichen mit den Anfangsschranken der Rennbahn*'. He quotes Enn. *Ann.* 57 and 88 *carceris oras* and Aus. *Ep.* 20, 17 *altera meta diei.* That 'the fifth border of the world' could mean 'for the fifth time from the border of the world' is most improbable. Mar. quotes Man. I 631-62 to support *ora* (presumably esp. 641 ff.). But its relevance is not clear.

(*h*)*ora* would give an unpleasant jingle (but not impossible): *ora...ora... rorantem...litora*, see II 1, 69-72n., II 2, 68-9n.

Schrader's *quinto...ortu* (see Haupt 1876, 126 ff.) is accepted by Baehrens and Mozl. It is a good correction: 'his fifth rising', see *Th.* I 501 *infundat Titan ortus*, III 32, VI 241 (*Lucifer*) *alterno deprenditur unus in ortu, Silv.* I 6, 9, Verg. *G.* I 432-3 *sin ortu quarto...per caelum ibit* (*Phoebe*), IV 544 *ubi nona suos Aurora ostenderit ortus.* (*H*)*ora* is a perseveration of *ora* at the beginning of the line. Perhaps Claud. *Stil.* II 467 *rorantes ortus* comes out of St.

The fifth day as the critical one in illness is found in real and spurious Hippocratic literature, e.g. *Epid.* I 7, 209, I 14, 19, see also Vérilhac no. 104 πέμπτῃ...ἐν ἠοῖ, though it is not so often mentioned as the seventh day, see Roscher 1906 (n° 6), 57, n. 96, 66, 68 ff., esp. the tables on 73-6. For the general magic power of the number five, see Plut. 388 ff., Iren. II 22, 4 and 24, 4, Macr. *Somn.* I 6, 18-20, Eyben 1973, 173-6.

For Phosphoros/Lucifer as the herald of dawn, riding a horse (which is probably a later conception), see *Th.* II 139 with Mulder, VI 239 with Fortgens, *Ach.* I 242-3, Smith on Tib. I 3, 93-4, and I 9, 62, Bardon 1946, 109.

sternebat equum: saddled his horse, *cf.* Liv. XXXVII 20, 4 and 12.

80-2. iam litora duri saeva...senis durumque Acheronta videbas: Instead of describing the boy's death (*Intr.*, see II 1, 148-53n.), St. mentions the *topos* of the terrors of the Underworld (II 1, 184-8n., 202-5n.): *duri, saeva, durum.*

For the phrase, *cf.* III 5, 37 *cum iam Lethaeos audirem comminus amnes.*

[9] Polster 1878, 12 quotes Mart. VIII 67, 9 and Plin. *Nat.* VI 171 to defend the text. These are both completely irrelevant.

With *vix* (79)...*iam* parataxis, like here, is usual, see *LHSz.* 624. It occurs also at I 6, 9-10 (parataxis), V 3, 199-200 (hypotaxis).

duri senis is Charon (II 1, 184-8n., 186n.), see Verg. *A.* VI 304 *senior...senectus,* 315 *navita tristis.*

litora saeva: though *saevus* is a frequent epithet in connection with the Underworld (e.g. V 2, 94, *Th.* V 312), St. may mean it as an etymological pun here, like *litora adusta* in II 1, 187 (n.): the banks of Styx/στυγερός, see Verg. *A.* VI 438-9 *tristisque palus inamabilis undae* and Bartelink 182-3. *Cf.* II 1, 163n., II 2, 36-42n.

durum Acheronta: here St. puns on ἄχος, *cf.* Theocr. 17, 47 Ἀχέρων πολύστονος and Bartelink *loc. cit.*

Philete...clamate: At this dramatic moment the boy's name is first mentioned and he is addressed, see II 1, 227-30n. This also happens at Priscilla's death in V 1, 150 (though not for the first time).

clamate = *conclamate,* bewailed, like *Th.* III 170 *mater Penthea clamat* (see Snijder), XII 805, here 5. For the voc., see *Th.* IX 778 *famulate.*

St. does not say that Ursus was present when Philetus died, and it seems that he was not, see *Intr.* By saying here that Ursus cried the boy's name St. suggests his presence. Crying the name of the dead one is a *topos* of the *descriptio funeris*: the name was cried there as a part of the ritual, see Rothstein on Prop. I 17, 23, Verg. *A.* III 67, Marquardt 346. For laments directly after death, see V 1, 197-208, V 3, 162 ff., *Epic. Drusi* 101-66, E.-F. 144 § 43.

82-4. Non saevius atros nigrasset planctu genetrix tibi saeva lacertos, nec pater: This is in M. Clouard is the only one to keep both *tibi* and *saeva* in 83 (and to print *secius* instead of *saevius*). He explains it as '*ta mère, avec furieuse douleur*'. Mar. accepts *sibi* out of Q.

But *et...qui vidit funera frater* (84) shows that the parents, who were not present at the funeral, are compared to the brother, who was. Therefore Polster's *salva* (1879, 18), accepted by all the other edd., is right. *Saeva* has its origin in *saeva* in 81 and *saevius* here, *cf.* Håk. 81. *Tibi salva* means 'had she lived'. It must be taken *apo koinou* with *pater.*

Of Philetus' parents nothing is known, *cf.* 21-33n. Notwithstanding, St. assumes here and in 99 that they are dead. Perhaps the boy and his brother were carried off as slaves in a raid.

nigrasset: Schamberger (309), Speranza (1956, 49), Vollm. and all translators think that *nigrare* is transitive here, 'she bruised her arms'. Håk. (81) tries to show that it is intransitive, with *lacertos* as an acc. of respect.

nigrare occurs only twice in classical Latin, here and at Lucr. II 733 *ea quae nigrant.* Elsewhere we have only the adj. *nigrans,* which means simply

'black', see André 1949, 52 and 271. In Lucr. II *nigrare* also means 'to be black'. *Albere, fuscare* and *livere* are always intransitive too (*cf.* Håk. 81). And in Luc. II 37 (*parens*) *planctu liventis atra lacertos, atra lacertos* is a parallel for *nigrasset...lacertos* as an acc. of respect.

On the other hand, apart from the part. *nigrans*, the only meaning of *nigrare* in non-classical Latin seems to be 'to make black', and Lucr. II 733 is the exception. See Probus IV 202, 7 (K.) *inter nigro et migro hoc interest, quod nigro...nigrum facio significat, migro autem...*, Tert. *Adv. Marc.* IV 8 *nigrati ignorantiae tenebris, Gloss.* II 366, 43 μελαίνω, *infusco, nigro*, and more in Schamberger 309. *Lacertos* is much more natural as an object; one would expect a transitive verb, as in III 3, 176-7 *lassantem bracchia planctibus.* If *nigrasset* is intransitive, *saevius* must mean something like 'violently (black)'. As parallels for that meaning Håk. adduces *Th.* III 589 *saevum rubuere ligones*, 211 *crudele rubebitis, amnes.* But *saevius* is more natural in the same sense as *saevae manus* in II 1, 169 about the hands beating the breast.

All in all *nigrare* is better taken as a transitive verb here. Schamberger (309 ff.) gives other verbs which were intransitive before St. and which he employs as transitive verbs: *flagrare* (V 2, 120), *aestuare* (I 3, 8), *fumare* (*Th.* VIII 400), *liqui* (*Th.* V 270), *mugire* (*Th.* VI 120), *reptare* (*Th.* V 581), *undare* (*Ach.* I 87), *lacrimare* (*Th.* IX 100), *obstupescere* (*Th.* III 520), *pavescere* (*Th.* XII 222), *consonare* (*Th.* III 494), *detonare* (II 7, 66), *immurmurare* (*Th.* XI 63), *extare* (I 2, 116), *praeludere* (I *Praef.* 10), *refulgere* (*Th.* VI 666), *introgredi* (*Th.* III 345). For transitive verbs used by St. in an intransitive sense, see Schamberger 318 ff.

nigrasset and *atros* refer to the dark livid colour of bruised flesh, see André 1949, 172-3. *Atros* is not proleptic for 'soiled with ash and dust', as Vollm. thinks. In these lines St. exploits the gloomy associations of the words *ater* and *niger*, see II 1, 19n., emphasizing the colours, see *erubuit* in 85.

The idea that the grief of members of the family is exceeded by someone else is also used in II 1, 174-5 (n.).

84-5. qui vidit funera frater erubuit vinci: The brother was ashamed that he showed less grief than Ursus did.

The infinitive following *erubescere* occurs since Livy and Verg. *Ecl.* 6, 2, see *LHSz.* 347. In St. also in I 4, 5.

With the *topos* of lamentation and the word *funera*, we have almost imperceptibly reached the *descriptio funeris*, introduced by *ignis* (86), *cf.* e.g. II 1, 158-9 *exequias...flammis...funera.*

85-93. DESCRIPTIO FUNERIS: It is shorter than the comparable section in II 1, 157 ff., but of similar construction: 85-6 introductory statement, *cf.* II 1, 157-8, V 1, 208-10; 86-90 luxury, closed by a *pointe, cf.* II 1, 159-65, V 1, 210-6 (no *pointe*); 90-3 grief of the survivor, *cf.* II 1, 166-74, V 1, 216-21. The end is different, however: instead of consoling comparisons (II 1, 179-82), the grief comes to a climax here in 92-3, and is immediately connected to the exhortation to stop lamenting, see II 1, 183-234n., 208-26n.

St. leaves aside here the *topos* of the survivor who wants to die (II 1, 24-5n., 169-72n.). Ursus' grief is virtually confined to *domini fletus*, as far as this poem is concerned (contrast II 1, 166-74), see *Intr.*

85-6. Sed nec servilis adempto ignis: St. refers again to the idea that Philetus was no slave (*Intr.*, 21-33n.). But *nec servilis ignis* implies also a compliment to Ursus' magnanimity, see II 1, 157-82n. It is contrasted with *domini fletus* (89).

For *sed*, 'you are dead, but' (Fr.), see II 4, 33 *at*, II 5, 24 *tamen.*

For *adempto*, dead, see II 1, 208n.

Note the variation *ignis, flamma* (86), *favillae* (89), *rogus* (90), *cineres* (91). See II 1, 2n., 128-35n., 157-82n., II 2, 21-5n., 49-51n., II 3, 1-5n., 1-7n., II 4, 1n., 17-23n.

86-9. Spices: For spices at the funeral in general, see II 1, 159-62n. Here St. mentions four spices, and, as a climax, the tears of Ursus (see 92-3n.), which are already suggested by *manantes* and *suci.*

odoriferos...Sabaeos: It is assumed that a specific product is meant here, see II 1 *loc. cit.* Then here either incense or myrrh must be mentioned, *cf.* Plin. *Nat.* XII 51 *principalia in illa* (*Arabia Felici*) *tus atque murra.* The Sabaei are also mentioned in connection with *cinnama* (IV 5, 31, V 3, 42), but this is already referred to in 88-9.

Flores Sabaei in V 1, 211 can refer to myrrh, see VFl. VI 709, Sen. *Her. O.* 376 *Sabaea...myrrha.* Incense has some support in IV 8, 1-2 *templa Sabaeis nubibus...imple*, see V 1, 212-3 *praereptaque templis tura* and esp. Verg. *G.* I 57 *India mittit ebur, molles sua tura Sabaei*, II 117 *solis est turea virga Sabaeis, A.* I 416 *centum...Sabaeo ture calent arae.* Incense is mentioned as *odoratae aristae* in V 3, 43 and see Plin. *Nat.* XII 57 *virgis etiam turis ad nos commeantibus.* So it seems probable that incense is meant by St.

exhausit...Sabaeos: See I 1, 42 *se totis Temese dedit hausta metallis*, Mart. II 29, 3 *Tyron expotavere flammae.* That *exhaurire* is a strong word appears from Cic. *Ver.* 5, 109 *cuius domum per hospitium exhausit et exinanivit.*

exhausit is constructed in two different ways semantically: here with a people (instead of a region) for its object; in 87-9 with the products for an

object: harvests, cinnamon, unguents and tears. Both senses, 'to drain of' and 'to use up', do occur, see *OLD* 5 and 4, e.g. Cic. *Att.* VI 1, 2 *exhaustam...provinciam* (first use), *Th.* X 838 *exhaustis...missilibus* (second use). St. strains the language here in adding *fletus* as a climax, an *aprosdoketon*, because it belongs to a semantic category different from both the other ones; nor is the expression *fletus exhausit* in itself an obvious one: 'using up' is mainly said of supplies, time, or (bodily or mental) resources. See *Th.* VIII 216 *exhaustus sermone dolor*, Cic. *Att.* II 21, 4 *tantus...amor ut exhauriri (non) posset, TLL* V² 1409, 46. In prose *aquam exhaurire* is said, but generally in a semi-technical context.

The Sabaei were the most important people of south-west Arabia (roughly Yemen). They existed from the spice-trade, see Theophr. *Hist. Plant.* IX 4, 2, *Kleine Pauly* IV 1476-7.

Cilicum messes: Saffron, see II 1, 159-62n.

Phariae...exempta volucri cinnama: Cinnamon stolen from the phoenix. For the phoenix, see II 1 *loc. cit.*, and for the connection between the phoenix and spices, see II 4, 36-7n. The bird is called Egyptian, *Phariae* (II 1, 72-5n.), because it travels to Egyptian Heliopolis with the body of its father to cremate it: Herod. II 73, *RE* XX 416 ff., *cf.* III 2, 114 *sibi praesternat vivax altaria Phoenix.*

The phoenix is especially connected with cinnamon, which seems to be the essential spice for its pyre: Solin. 33, 11 ff., Sid. *Carm.* 22, 50-1 *post perdita cinnama Phoenix formidans mortem sibi non superesse secundam,* Claud. *Stil.* II 415, *Carm.* 31, 15-6. Sidonius never fails to mention cinnamon in connection with the phoenix: *Carm.* 2, 417; 7, 353; 9, 325 *Indo cinnamon ex rogo petitum, quo Phoenix iuvenescit occidendo,* 11, 125, *cf.* 16, 17.

This link between the phoenix and cinnamon is also found in Plin. *Nat.* XII 85, who tells that cinnamon is found in the bird's nest and ascribes this story to Herodotus (meaning III 111, where the phoenix is not named). See, for the many confusions and doublets in the accounts of Herod., Arist. and Pliny, Hubaux-Leroy 69-76, also *RE* XX 414 ff.

The plural *cinnama* is prescribed by metre (*cīnnămŭm*) and occurs 4 times in St., see Maas 508, Neue-W. 612-3. St. mentions only cinnamon by name in the catalogue here, but avoids banality by adding his mythological allusion.

Assyrio manantes gramine sucos: Amomum, see II 4, 34-6n.; and for *gramen* and *sucus*: II 1, 169-72n.

89-90. hos tantum hausere favillae, hos bibit usque rogus: Only the tears of Ursus were entirely absorbed by the ashes. Both *tantum* and *usque* are *apo koinou.* St. emphasizes the tragic situation by repetition (*hos*) and variation (*hausit/bibit, favillae/rogus/cineres*(91)).

The extinction of the pyre with wine is foreshadowed here (see below). Perhaps St. also alludes to the idea that the survivor drinks in the flames, *cf.* II 1, 24-5n., V 3, 32 *cinerem oculis hausi.*

The poetic plural of *favilla* occurs for the first time at *Eleg. Maec.* 2, 21 (probably) *cineres interque favillas* (by analogy?). Lucr., Hor. and Verg. employ only *favilla(m)*, Ov. has one *favillae*, at *Fast.* III 561. St. has a preference for the plural: 8 times, against 2 sing. (II 1, 2, *Th.* I 222). See Maas 519.

90-2. tibi Setia canos restinxit cineres...ossa...vallavit onyx: St. refers to the *ossilegium*, the collecting of the bones and ashes to put them into an urn. Before this was done, the ashes were sprinkled with wine, see Hom. *Il.* XXIII 250, Prop. IV 7, 34, Verg. *A.* VI 227-8 (with Austin's and Norden's notes), Tib. I 3, 5-8 (with Smith), III 2, 17 (Lygdamus), Luc. IX 60, *Th.* VI 235-6 (with Fortgens), E.-F. 146 §46C, Marquardt 382, Blümner 1884, 501.

The 12 Tables prohibited the use of wine for this purpose (Cic. *Leg.* II 24, 60, *cf.* Plin. *Nat.* IV 2, XIV 88), but this seems to have been disregarded.

Setia is wine from present-day Sezzia in Latium. It was famous (e.g. Mart. XIII 23, 1) and was made popular by Augustus, *cf.* Plin. *Nat.* XIV 61.

cineres usually refers to the remnants of the pyre in general, while *favillae* is used of the ashes of the body, see Plin. *Nat.* XIX 19 and Austin and Norden on Verg. *A.* VI 227. But here *tibi...cineres* rather suggests the meaning 'your ashes', *cf.* Prop. II 13, 31 *cinerem me fecerit.* For the poetic plur., see II 1, 54-5n.

For *canos*, see II 2, 7 (n.). It is also used of ashes at *Th.* I 512, *cf.* Ov. *Ars* II 440 *canere*, André 1949, 66.

onyx is alabaster, a much-prized kind of marble, see *TLL* IX² 654, 44 ff. It was almost invariably used to make small boxes for unguents, e.g. Prop. II 13, 30, Mart. VII 94, 1. In the first cent. B.C. it began to be used as a luxury good: Plin. *Nat.* XXXVI 59 *Nepos...tradit magno fuisse miraculo, cum P. Lentulus Spinter amphoras ex eo Chiorum magnitudine cadorum ostendisset: post quinquennium deinde triginta duorum pedum longitudine columnas vidisse se* (see *Silv.* I 5, 35). After gold and silver it was the most precious thing which urns could be made of, see Toynbee 1971, 50.

For the metonymy, the material instead of the jar, see Catul. 66, 82, Hor. *Carm.* IV 12, 27, *OLD* 1b. In prose the word *onyx* occurs only in technical discussions.

vallavit, 'surrounded', is strange in this connection, for it is usually said of fortifying a camp. But see *Th.* X 564 *arae vallantur planctibus.*

92-3. nec quod...gremio nec lubricus ossa quod vallavit onyx, miseris acceptius umbris quam gemitus: *Quod* depends in both cases on *nec...acceptius* (*est*).

The postposition of *nec* (the second *nec* here) is rather frequent in *Silv.* II; it occurs 7 times: II 1, 140, 184, II 2, 57, II 3, 60, II 4, 36, II 6, 30 and here. In Verg. it is much more rare: twice in the *Ecl.*, 3 times in the *G.*, see Norden *A.* VI *Anhang* III (who gives 5 as the number for Tib.). This is in contrast to the postposition of *sed*, which is rather infrequent in *Silv.* II, see II 1, 78-81n. (and for *et* II 2, 81-2n.).

But this postposition of *nec* is weak and almost obligatory in most of the cases from *Silv.* II: with a pronoun (II 1, 140, 184, II 6, 30), or when *nec* has a special meaning (II 2, 57: *ne...quidem*, II 3, 60 *iam nec* = *non iam*). The only comparable case is II 4, 36 *senio nec.*

Though St. thus appears no less careful than Verg., he has *nec* twice as the third word (II 1, 142 and 229), which is not found in Verg., see Norden *loc. cit.*

If *quod* is also explained as a postponement here, this is unparalleled in the *Silvae*: it occupies the second position in 3 instances, II 2, 87 (the relative), II 5, 27 and III 1, 60.

gremio, 'its lap', for an urn is exceptional. It is only used of a pocket in the earth, seldom for the inner part of a mountain, or the depth of the sea. Only Mart. XIV 61 employs it for a lantern. See *TLL* VI 2322, 57 ff., 2323, 3 ff.

lubricus is polished, smooth, see Mart. VI 42, 14 *pinguis onyx*, Sid. *Carm.* 11, 25 *crassus onyx.*

acceptius quam gemitus: St. says that lamenting is the most precious gift for the dead, see III 3, 212-3 *Assyrios felix bibet urna liquores et lacrimas, qui maior honos*, V 3, 40 ff. *nec...nec...sed carmine plango.* One may be reminded of Propertius' revelling in the thought of Cynthia's grief at his death.

On the other hand, St. turns around in the next line to tell Ursus that he must leave well alone, see below. *Gemitus* ends the *lamentatio* with explicit grief (contrast II 1, 175-8n.). The *consolatio* follows finally to relieve the tension. It is connected to this section by *gemitus* = *dolori, damna, vulnus, luctibus, doleri* (93-7).

93-105. CONSOLATIO: This can be divided into three parts: **1)** 93-8, where Ursus is addressed and exhorted, rather harshly, to stop lamenting; **2)** 98-102, the description of Philetus' arrival in the Underworld; **3)** 103-5 renewed address to Ursus and the promise of a possible replacement for the boy. Thus address frames a middle part; this is underlined by the correspondence of *et ipse iuvat* (93) and *et ipse dabit* (104).

On a closer view, however, there is argument throughout: the four insistent questions (93-6) are seen all to contain an argument: they are phrased in such a fashion that Ursus must realise that he is in the wrong: *damna foves, vulnus amas, caram crucias umbram.* Similarly, 97-8 conclude a reason for sorrow with a final emphatic reason to stop it: *solvisti* (first word in the line and an entire clause in itself). That the deceased one enters Elysium is also an argument, from the *consolatio*, see II 1, 183-234n., 183-207n. Elysium, moreover, is not pictured as a gloomy place here (contrast II 1, 202-5n.), see *amoena* 100; and three reasons are given why Philetus will be happy there, *i.e.* why Ursus must not mourn. A final reconciliation between the dead one and the survivor concludes the poem, punctuated by a final breathtaking (*pone, precor, questus*). The poem ends on an optimistic note, *amorem.*

93-8. St. forbids Ursus to mourn: See on 92-3 above, Vollm. here, II 1, 183-234n. Usually the poet comes more gradually from '*Trauer*' to '*Trost*': III 3, 195, V 3, 277, Ov. *Am.* II 6, 49, III 9, 59, see E.-F. 124-5. Here he assumes almost the role of the prosaic *consolator, cf.* II 1, 208 *quin tu iam vulnera sedas*? (where, however, the *consolatio* is already under way), V 1, 247 (but E.-F. 99), *Epic. Drusi* 317 ff. *Cf.* e.g. Sen. *Ep.* 99, 2 *solacia expectas, convicia accipe*, Kassel 3 ff., II 1 *Intr.*

E.-F. claims (124-5) that the *consolatio* never begins as unexpectedly as here in poetry, see also II 1, 183-234n. On the other hand, *sed* (93) is used here in the same way as it is used elsewhere at the beginning of the *consolatio*, see II 4, 33-4 *at* (n.), II 5, 26. The identification of *consolator* and *consolandus* is guaranteed here by *damus*, which implies that St. does not throw all the blame on Ursus.

93-5. Sed—et ipse iuvat—quid terga dolori, Urse, damus?: The first argument is general, 'do not be weak'. It is first stated in general terms, 'why flee?'. This is followed by more specific reproaches to Ursus (94-6).

Immoderation in grief is castigated *ad nauseam* by Seneca, e.g. *Ep.* 63, esp. 1-3, 13-4 *dolor vicit, Ep.* 98, 18 *dolori resistere*, 99, 1-2 and 15-21, *Dial.* VI 2, XI 4, 3 *respicientes quantum a tergo rerum tristium immineat*, see also Hor. *Carm.* II 9, 17-8 *desine mollium tandem querellarum* and Nisbet-H. 137, E.-F. 150 § 57-8.

The more specific argument lies in *et ipse iuvat*, the boy himself helps you, for he does not want your grief. This argument is also found at II 1, 231, *Epic. Drusi* 467-8, *cf.* Cic. *Amic.* 20, 73, Sen. *Dial.* XII 5, 1-3, Plut. *Cons. Ap.* 37, 121F, Lucian. *De Luctu* 16. Menander suggests to say τάχα που καὶ μέμφεται τοῖς θρηνοῦσι (ὁ μεταστάς) (414, 21 *Sp.*). See also below at 96.

This explanation implies that I assume, with Vollm. and most editors, that *ipse* = Philetus (not Postg., Clouard and Mozl., who translates 'yet can even tears avail him?'); and that *et ipse iuvat* is a parenthesis, '(he himself encourages you)' (not Mar.). Conjectures are superfluous (*vetat*: Jortin, *flesse*: Housman 1906, 43, printed by Phill., *instat*: Saenger, *iubet*: anon. Göttingensis), see van Dam 402.

For *terga damus*, see II 5, 19 (n.).

For a possible pun in *Urse*, see 10-2n. and II 2, 23n.

Quid damna foves: V 1, 247-8 *quid nunc immodicos...fletus corde foves longumque vetas exire dolorem?* For *damna* as 'loss', *cf.* III 1, 173 *luctus et tristia damna*, III 3, 41, V 5, 47, *Th.* V 500. The poetic plur. occurs since Ov. Except for II 1, 156, St. employs always the plur.

pectore iniquo vulnus amas: For *vulnus* as 'loss', see II 1, 1-13n., 6-8n. here. *Quid...vulnus amas?* is equivalent to II 1, 208 *quin tu...vulnera sedas.* For the clause, see III 3, 20 /*frigus amat, Th.* IX 114 /*corpus amat*, XII 195 /*funus amat.*

Ubi nota reis facundia raptis?: The usual explanation of this phrase is 'where is your eloquence, which is well-known to defendants who are brought into court?'. This leads to the conclusion that Ursus was a solicitor, see *Intr.* under **II.**

The text is not completely satisfying: *rapere* in the sense 'to take forcibly, hale (before a magistrate, to punishment etc.)' (*OLD* 7b) is always accompanied by an adjunct; (*reum*) *rapere* is not found without *in ius* (Pl. *Cur.* 723 *ad praetorem...rapiam, Poen.* 1336 *rapiamus in ius*, Hor. *S.* I 9, 77 *rapit in ius*, II 3, 72 *cum rapies in ius*, see *OLD* 7b). Kl. (*app.*) compares Cic. *Rab. Post.* 11 *est arreptus...eques Romanus de pecuniis repetundis reus* and *Flac.* 5 *rapitur ad poenam.* But neither of these is to the point. Poliziano (*Comm.*) explains *raptis* as *e iudicio.*

The question can imply 'Ursus, you are neglecting your profession'; but then it fits somewhat strangely in the context of reproaches that Ursus does torment Philetus and himself. Or St. merely means 'why do you not use your famous eloquence now to console yourself?' This is what E.-F. (153 § 74) takes it to mean, and it seems to be the most obvious explanation. It is possible that St. throws in the defendants here (*reis*) as an extra compliment to Ursus. Nevertheless, the text would, I think, be more satisfactory with *aliis* instead of *reis.*

The phrase *ubi nota aliis facundia raptis?* would mean 'where is your eloquence, which is well-known when others are dead?'. The question then implies 'you could always console others, now help in consoling yourself'. It is the answer to *quid...foves et...amas*, as *solvisti* is the answer to *quid...crucias.* This argument is frequently employed by St. himself, as 'I am able to console, for I am experienced' (II 1, 30-4, III 3, 39-42, *cf.*

Sen. *Ep.* 63, 14, *Dial.* XII 2, 1) or as 'I could always comfort others, but now I seem to be unable to comfort myself' (V 1, 38 ff., e.g. 49-50 *copia fandi nulla mihi,* see *Epic. Drusi* 9-10, Cic. *Tusc.* III 29, 71, E.-F. 153 § 73).

The corruption *nota reis* could have its origin in *nota liis.* For *raptus,* dead, see II 1, 208-9n. The only one to have stumbled over the text here seems to be Saenger, who wrote *castis* for *raptis.* If *reis* is wrong, Ursus' profession as a solicitor disappears into nothing.

Though *aliis* is attractive, I do not venture to print it here.

96. Quid caram crucias...umbram?: See V 1, 180 *nec crucia fugientem coniugis umbram.* That the dead one is vexed by the grief of the survivor (*cf.* on 93-5 above) is also stated at Tib. I 1, 67-8 *tu manes ne laede meos,* Hor. *Carm.* II 9, 9-10 *tu semper urgues flebilibus modis Mysten,* Ov. *Fast.* II 506. Behind it is the ancient popular thought that the peace of the dead is disturbed by the grief of the survivors, see *CE* 963, 12 *manes parcite iam luctu sollicitare meos,* 995, 9 and 1198, 11 ff. See Vollm., Lier 1904, 55-6, Lattimore 217 ff., Nisbet-H. on Hor. *loc. cit.*, E.-F. 150 §§ 57-8.

97-8. eximius licet ille animi: (*sit*). *Sit* is omitted at *Th.* II 430, 446, III 375, 482, 698, IV 576, VI 317, *Ach.* I 143, 776, 780, see Brinkgreve on *Ach.* I 143, *LHSz.* 421-2. The omission occurs both in main and in dependent sentences. See also II *Praef.* 19-23n., II 2, 6-9n., II 7, 31-5n.

Licet (as a conjunction) and *quamvis* are equally frequent in St. But he prefers *licet* in the epics and *quamvis* in the *Silvae*: *licet* is found in 20 instances in the *Th.*, 2 times in the *Ach.* and 6 times in the *Silv.* (I 4, 25, here, III 4, 13, III 5, 5, IV 9, 6, V 1, 23). *Quamvis* occurs 15 times in the *Th.*, not in the *Ach.*, 13 times in the *Silv.*

It is difficult to account for this distribution: *quamvis* is not in VFl., for instance, but does occur in serious poetry otherwise, see *LHSz.* 604. *Licet*, on the other hand, is frequent in Mart. and esp. Juv. (*LHSz.* 605). So we would rather expect St. to prefer *licet* in the *Silv.* and *quamvis* in the epics. Apparently with *licet* and *quamvis,* as is the case with *quamquam,* personal taste is decisive in making a choice, see II 1, 144-5n. It is improbable that St. in later age developed a preference for *quamvis,* or that the literary taste of his time did so: in the latter half of the Thebaid *licet* is not less frequent than in the first half (*quamvis* a bit more), and in his last work, the Achilleid, *quamvis* does not occur. Moreover, it is *licet* which apparently becomes more and more frequent in Latin (*LHSz. loc. cit.*). See also II 1, 16n. and on *forsan* below (101).

eximius...animi: the construction of *eximius* with the gen. is not unusual for adjectives of classification, *cf.* Vel. I 12, 3 *eminentissimus ingenii.* The

gen. *animi*, moreover, is esp. frequent in free uses of the gen., see V 1, 37 *macte animi, LHSz.* 75 and 79.

meritusque doleri: For the passive inf. with *meritus*, see V 1, 42 *amor...meritus...probari.* St. refers back to 10-1 *amore fideque...meritum lacrimas*, see II 1, 29, III *Praef.* 15-6 *Merebatur...Etrusci...pietas...solamen.*

solvisti: 'You have paid your debt'. This argument is not found in other consolatory literature, see E.-F. 153 § 72.

98-103. Descent into the Underworld: For this *topos* as comfort, see II 1, 183-207n. Here St. does not exploit its horrors and he has combined what in II 1 he had separated: the theme of meeting friends or pious dead and the somewhat harsh therapeutic treatment. Philetus will meet two groups, humans and (demi-)gods. The humans are divided into the *pii* (98) and (=) his parents, who are, perhaps, noble (99). The divine persons are fitted into the same scheme: nymphs (101-2) and the queen of Elysium, who will cast a desiring glance at him.

98-100. Subit ille pios: See II 1, 153-7n. (*subivit*); and for the *pii manes*, see V 1, 250, V 3, 28, Ov. *Am.* II 6, 49 ff. (*cf.* II 4, 8-9n.), *Eleg. Maec.* 131 ff., Luc. III 12.

Note the emphatic repetition of *ille, illic* (99-100).

carpitque quietem Elysiam: For the phrase *quietem carpere*, see Pease on Verg. *A.* IV 522-3 *carpebant fessa soporem corpora*, VII 414 *carpebat...quietem*, Sil. XVII 160 *carpit...quietem*, see *Th.* III 109 *Elysias, i, carpe plagas*[10].

clarosque illic fortasse parentes invenit: And he finds his parents there, who may be of high rank. *Fortasse* goes with *claros*, as was first seen by Rinn. Bernaert's *caros* is, surprisingly, accepted by Markl., Baehr. and Kl., defended by Merrill 99: *claros* is essential: the parents, and therefore Philetus himself, may be of high birth, see *Intr.*, 21-33n., 85-6n.

As also appears in II 1, dead persons in St. are '*presque plus actives dans l'au-delà qu'elles ne l'étaient de leur vivant*' (Hegyi 98). This may be a bit exaggerated, but St. goes certainly much farther than Horace or the elegists in his representations of a dead person's activities after death. See also 103-5, II 7, 107 ff., V 1, 258 ff., V 3, 19-27 and 284 ff.

100-2. aut illic per amoena silentia Lethes forsan Avernales adludunt undique mixtae Naides: The idea of nymphs of the Underworld (*Avernales...Naides*) is first found in Ov. *Met.* V 539-41 *Ascalaphus...quem quondam dicitur Orphne/inter Avernales haud ignotissima nymphas/ex Acheronte*

[10] The Concordance does not distinguish the noun *Elysium* (5 times; in the *Silvae*: II 1, 204, II 3, 74 and II 7, 112) from the adj. *Elysius* (17 times).

suo furvis peperisse sub antris. This and St. are the only literary references to these nymphs. Sil. VI 171-2 has nymphs of *lacus Avernus*, but they are not in the Underworld. Vollm. quotes *CE* 1233, 19 *sive canistriferae poscunt sibi Naides* (the dead boy). But these are a different concept (as *CIL* VI 29195 shows: *raptus a nymphis vix a. VIIII*), namely of the nymphs stealing and killing people. On South Italian vases Naiads of the Underworld are painted. They may have been mentioned first in Greek Hellenistic poetry, see Gaymann 39.

Note that St. changes the gloomy atmosphere in Ovid (Ascalaphus is later changed into the *bubo*) into a pretty, gay picture. From Ovid he retains Proserpina (Ascalaphus reports Proserpina's eating of the pomegranate), but he turns her into a vignette of an amorous woman.

For *Avernales*, connected with the Underworld, see V 3, 172, Hor. *Epod.* 5, 26, Prop. IV 1, 49, Austin on Verg. *A.* VI 126.

All edd., except for Clouard and Mozl., follow σ in correcting M's *illic* into *illi*, but without arguing it. The correction seems unnecessary. *Adludere* can be used without a dative, e.g. Ov. *Met.* II 864, Plin. *Nat.* IX 24, Plin. *Ep.* IX 33, 6 (boys playing alongside a dolphin). The context is clear enough to supply (*Phileto*). It is not clear why *illic...illic* is suspicious, after *ille...ille* (97-8). *Illic* refers to *quietem Elysiam* and is specified by *per...silentia Lethes.*

amoena silentia Lethes: see II 4, 8 *aeterna silentia Lethes.* Vollm. thinks that the Naiads play in the water while Philetus is being transported by Charon. Charon is sometimes thought of as sailing Lethe; that is, the rivers of the Underworld are sometimes confused (or metonymically used for each other), see *Th.* I 297 with Heuvel's note, IV 622, XII 559, II 7, 101 (n.), Norden on *A.* VI 295 ff. But it is more natural in this peaceful atmosphere to assume that Philetus is playing near (or in) Lethe, see II 1, 194-8n.

forsan: the indicative mood with it occurs at *Th.* X 335 (see Williams there), 447, XII 398, since Verg., see *LHSz.* 334.

In his use of *fortasse, forsan* and *forsitan* St. differs completely from what could be expected. Axelson (31-2, see *LHSz.* 335) makes it clear that **1)** *fortasse* is rarely or not used in poetry. *Forsitan* dominates in Augustan poetry; *forsan* does so (slightly) in silver Latin poetry. *Fortasse* occurs once in Verg. *A.*, not in Ov. *Met.*, Lucr., Tib., Prop., Hor. lyr., twice in Luc., 4 times in Sen. trag. **2)** *fortasse* has only '*eine relativ grosse Rolle...in den niederen Dichtungsarten*' (Axelson *loc. cit.*). It occurs 7 times in Mart. (*forsan* 6, *forsitan* 9), 5 times in Juv. (2, 6), 6 times in Hor. *Ep.* and *S.* (0, 0), 12 times in Ov. eleg. (8, 75).

St. however has *fortasse* 10 times, of which 7 in the Thebaid, 2 in the *Silvae* (1 in a prose preface). *Forsan* occurs only twice in the epics, but 8

times in the *Silvae*. And *forsitan* occurs 8 times in the epics, once in the *Silvae*. So it seems that, if St. tried to avoid one of these words in his epics, it is not the 'un-poetic' *fortasse*, but rather the 'elevated' *forsan*. And in the *Silvae* he prefers *forsan* as much over *fortasse* as over *forsitan*.

The only conclusion that we can draw is that St. does not follow his predecessors in epic; he seems to have his personal preferences, which may be influenced by the prose of his time: Tacitus has a clear preference for *fortasse* over *forsitan* (Axelson *loc. cit.*). See also 97-8n.

obliquoque notat Proserpina vultu: *Obliquus*, with a sidelong glance, is a favourite word of St., see Heuvel on *Th.* I 447, Snijder on III 266. Since *obliquus* occurs frequently in a context where someone is angry (*Th.* III 377 *respectentve truces obliquo lumine*, IV 606, X 887, Sen. *Thy.* 706, *al.*), commentators and translators explain *obliquo vultu* here as 'Proserpina looks with a sidelong glance at the Naiads because she is jealous of them' (Vollm., Clouard, Fr.).

But *obliquo vultu* means rather 'with a stealthy look'. Proserpina wants to look at the boy without being noticed, either by him or by Pluto: *Ach.* I 323-4 *visusque protervos obliquat* (Achilles does not want his mother to see him blushing), 766 *comitique obliquo lumine monstrat* (Odysseus indicates Achilles to Tydeus in a way that others will not notice), II 27-8 *obliquos...vultus declinat.* Barth quotes analogous Greek phrases for '*amantes dum mutui affectus sunt incerti*'.

notat belongs to this explanation, for it means 'to single out for some purpose' (*OLD* 7): Ov. *Ars* I 109 *oculis notant sibi quisque puellam quam velit*, see V 1, 139-40 (68-70n. here).

So *obliquo lumine notat* means that Proserpina looks at the boy without showing it, either to himself (because she is not sure whether he will respond) or to Pluto (because he will be angry).

The implication in *adludunt Naides* is made explicit here, *viz.* that Philetus will be loved and desired by the divinities of the Underworld, *cf.* Aus. *Epitaph.* 35, 7-8 *aut Persephonae Cinyreius ibi Adonis/aut Iovis Elysii tu catamitus eris.* St. omits the last half of this (though Poliziano (1978) explains *obliquo vultu* as *vel ut amans ipsa vel zelotypia, ne ille a Plutone ametur*) and makes the queen of the Underworld the climax of the argument 'Philetus will be happy in Elysium'.

103. Pone, precor, questus: For *pone...questus*, see II 1, 48-9n., 183n., Sil. IX 350 *pone, precor, lacrimas.*

precor together with the imperative occurs at III 2, 12, III 4, 1, V 1, 179, V 2, 84, *Th.* VI 171, VII 249, VIII 743, IX 59, 623, X 671, 773, XI 736, 738, XII 648, 816.

103-5. alium tibi Fata Phileton forsan et ipse dabit: 'The Fates, or perhaps the boy himself, will give you a new Philetus'. This is a harsh

variation on some consolatory topics: 'you still have a child (or an other dear one) left': *Epic. Drusi* 471-2, Sen. *Dial.* VI 3, 2 and 4, 2 and 5, 6, *cf.* E.-F. 151 § 64. Or, alternatively, 'you can still beget an other child': Thuc. II 44, 3 καρτερεῖν δὲ χρὴ καὶ ἄλλων παίδων ἐλπίδι, Eur. *frg.* 757, 3 N., Dionys. *Epit.* 28, 12. What St. means is said in so many words by Sen. *Ep.* 63, 11 *Quem amabas extulisti, quaere quem ames*, see *Dial.* VI 16, 17-8. *Cf.* II 1, 226-34n. and 230-4n.

St. does his best to soften the harsh thought: Philetus (like Glaucias in II 1) is loved in Elysium, so he does not have to be jealous of a successor. Nay, he himself chooses this successor and instructs him joyfully, so that the new boy becomes in reality a second Philetus: from *alium* to *similem* (105, see below). This idea can not be paralleled from other consolatory literature. It is esp. strange that the boy seeks out a successor in Elysium; this recalls the *metempsychosis* at the end of Aeneid VI.

Here St. exceeds the *topos* 'the dead one will return in a dream' (II 1, 226-234n.). Not Philetus will return in a dream, but his replica will come to Ursus in real life.

The boy's name is mentioned at the end of the poem, as in II 1, 230, *cf.* 227-30n. there.

For the metaphor in *alium Phileton*, see 54-5n., 61-2n.

In the traditional reconciliation at the end of the poem (II 1, 230-4n.), the Fates, who snatch away life (59, *al.*), become the givers.

et is *etiam* here, see II 2, 81-2n.

moresque habitusque decoros monstrabit gaudens: *Habitusque* is in Q. M has *habiture*, see van Dam 402. For the combination *mores* and *habitus*, see 21-3.

For *-que...-que*, see II 1, 120n., 52-3n. above, 67.

For *decoros*, see 36, 38, 43, II 1, 36-136n.

For *monstrabit*, 'he will instruct', see II 5, 1n.

similemque docebit amori: This is in M. Only Vollm. keeps this text, explaining it as 'he (Philetus) will teach him (the new boy) to become like your (Ursus') lover (Philetus)'. This is very improbable.

Q had *amari* and was corrected by q into *amorem. Amari* is printed by Phill., Mar. and Traglia (but not Traglia-Ar.). It should mean 'he will teach this boy, who is like himself, to be loved (by Ursus)'.

Amorem means 'he will teach this boy a love which is as deep as his own love'. It is not clear why *amari* is more strong, as Nisbet (1978, 8) claims. It is *amorem* which is needed: Ursus is comforted with the thought that the new boy will love him as much as Philetus did (and does). Both the situation and the wording remind of II 1, 207 *et alternum pueri partitur amorem* (II 1, 194-207n., 206-7n.). See also van Dam 403.

For a possible pun in *Phileton...amorem*, see II 2, 23n.

II. 7. GENETHLIACON LUCANI AD POLLAM

Birthday poems:
V. Buchheit, *Statius' Geburtstaggedicht zu Ehren Lukans* (*Silv. 2, 7*). Hermes 88 (1960), 231-49.
V. Buchheit, *Martial's Beitrag zum Geburtstag Lukans als Zyklus.* Philologus 105 (1961), 90-6.
F. Cairns, *Propertius III 10 and Roman Birthdays.* Hermes 99 (1971), 149-55.
F. Cairns, *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry* (Edinburgh 1972), 112 ff., 135 ff., 168-9, 221.
E. Cesareo, *Il carme natalizio nella poesia latina.* Palermo 1929.
W. Schmidt, *Geburtstag im Altertum.* Giessen 1908.
W. Schmidt, *Genethlios Hemera.* In: *RE* VII (1912), 1135-49.

II 7:
V. Buchheit, Hermes 88 (1960), 231-49. See above.
S. T. Newmyer, *The Silvae of Statius. Structure and Theme* (Leiden 1979), 26, 75-80.
R. G. M. Nisbet, *Felicitas at Surrentum* (*Statius* **Silvae** *II 2*). JRS 68 (1978), 1-11.

Lucan:[1]
F. M. Ahl, *Lucan. An Introduction.* Ithaca/London 1976.
Ed. M. Durry, *Lucain.* Genève 1970 (Entr. Fond. Hardt).
E. Mensching, *Lukans Schriftenverzeichnis bei Statius* (**Silv.** *II 7*). Hermes 97 (1969), 252-5.
K. F. C. Rose, *Problems in the Chronology of Lucan's Career.* TAPhA 97 (1966), 379-96.
W. Rutz, *Lukanbibliographie.* Lustrum 9 (1964), 243-334 and Lustrum 10 (1965), 246-56.
Ed. W. Rutz, *Lucan.* Darmstadt 1970.
W. Rutz, *Lukan.* To appear in ANRW. *Prinzipat. Sprache und Literatur.*

I. The second book of the *Silvae* closes with a poem on the birthday of the dead Lucan. St. himself calls it *genethliacon Lucani* at II *Praef.* 24. In some respects it resembles Sts.' *consolationes.*

Birthday poems are well attested in Latin literature: Tib. I 7, II 2, Sulpicia *poet.* 5, 6, Prop. III 10, Ov. *Tr.* III 13, V 5, Pers. 2, Mart. VII 21, 22, 23, IX 52, 53, X 24, Paul. Nol. *Carm.* 12-28, Sid. *Carm.* 17, Ennod. *CSEL* VI 424 ff., *Anth.Lat.* 638, *cf.* Hor. *Carm.* IV 11 (not a real *genethliacon*), Cairns 1972, 113 with n. 14, Buchheit 1960, 241 and 1961, 91. It seems useful to distinguish three kinds of poems in this field: **1)** 'real' birthday poems, which have the day itself for their subject, **2)** poems accompanying or representing a birthday-gift, **3)** poems just offering good wishes.

For **2)** see II 3 *Intr.* Out of **3)**, of which *AP* IX 349 and Aus. *Ep.* 21 are examples, arose the birthday-speech (e.g. Himerius *Or.* 8) and its theory, which is treated by Ps.-Dion. II 266-8 (Us.-R.) and Menander III 412 f.

---

[1] Many studies on Lucan make use of *Silv.* II 7 as a source. It would be useless to mention them all. The few recent titles quoted here are bibliographical or cover a wide field or are especially relevant for *Silv.* II 7.

(*Sp.*). All the poems quoted above, together with II 7, belong to **1)**, the 'real' *genethliaca*, which combine praise of the person whose birthday it is with a description of the festive happenings. There are, however, two reservations: the word *genethliacon* is not found before St. (II *Praef.* 24-6n.); and the most conspicuous common trait of all these poems is their originality and independence, see Buchheit 1961, 91[2].

The *genethliaca* are nevertheless characterized by a similar structure: mention of the day in the beginning, followed by an invocation to the *Genius* (see 5-11n., 120-3n.), praise of the addressee, and finally a prayer for him. The following *topoi* occur in the poems: the wearing of white clothes (10 here), offering incense and a *liba* to the *Genius* (16), a prayer for epiphany and protection to the *Genius, Natalis* or an other divine power and the coronation of his altar (12-5n.), see *RE* VII 1143, Cairns 1971, 152-3, Buchheit 1961, 91[3].

Sts.' independence of other birthday poems is largely dictated by the subject of II 7: a dead man and a poet (well illustrated by Buchheit 1960).

This poem is the only *genethliacon* for someone who is dead, together with Mart. VII 21, 22, 23 also on Lucan (see below). Keeping the anniversaries of dead persons was common. This was done for philosophers or heroes, like Socrates, Plato, Epicurus (Diog. L. X 14 and 18, Plut. *Quaest. Conv.* VIII 1, 1); but also for ordinary people (*IG* XII 3, 330, *CIL* II 11-3, XIV 326, 2112). See Herod. IV 26, *RE* VII 1137, 1144. Vergil's birthday was celebrated by Silius Italicus (Plin. *Ep.* III 7, 8) and Martial (Mart. XII 67). That of Brutus and Cassius was celebrated by Thrasea and Helvidius (Juv. 5, 36-7 with Friedländer), that of Otho by his nephew (Suet. *Dom.* 10). See Sen. *Ep.* 64, 8 *quidni ego magnorum virorum... natales celebrem.* In Rome *collegia* were given a sum to celebrate the birthday of a deceased person, see II 1, 191-3n. It seems probable that poetry was sometimes involved: Melior founded a fund with the *collegium scribarum* (II 1, 191-3n.). Polla Argentaria, Lucan's widow, who commissioned II 7 and Mart. VII 21-23, was probably not the only survivor to want a poem.

---

[2] I think that Newmyer (24-5) confuses the issue by quoting IV 7, which (partly) congratulates Vibius Maximus on the birth of his child, and IV 8, which does the same for Iulius Menecrates. They belong to kind **3)**, not **1)**. The prescripts of the rhetors, which Newmyer also quotes, equally ignore the religious ceremonies of the day itself, which always occur in kind **1)**. Moreover, they represent the third phase in a series poetry-speech-theory. Therefore it is not surprising that II 7 is 'far different from what the handbooks prescribe for the *genethliacon*' (Newmyer 26). Cesareo (esp. 130-1) insists on Sts.' dependence on rhetoric theory, without proof or probability.

[3] The scheme may have its origins in Hellenistic literature, notably Callimachus, but this is uncertain, see Buchheit 1960, 241.

The fact that Lucan is dead causes II 7 to share some *topoi* with Sts.' *consolationes*: there is a *laudatio* (24 ff.), grief is expressed in a kind of *lamentatio* (89 ff.) and there is something like a *consolatio* (107 ff.). But the poem is fundamentally different from a *consolatio*, because the tension between grief and solace is absent (II 1 *Intr.*). Moreover, the rest of the elements in the poem does not really match II 1 and II 6: *encomium* is always as much present in the *genethliacon* as in the *consolatio* (Cairns 1972, 137, Buchheit 1960, 244); in II *Praef.* 28 St. says *laudes...dicturus*, but he does not refer to grief or comfort. Moreover, only Lucan's poetical achievements are praised, whereas praise of appearance, habits *etc.* is never omitted in Sts.' *consolationes* (II 1, 56-66n., 72-105n., II 6, 21-57n.). The consolation of 107 ff. is much rather an invocation (and Newmyer (26) is wrong and misleading in saying that *solacia* in 128 refers to Sts.' reflections). It is Sts.' original solution of the obligatory invocation of the *Genius* at the birthday of a living person. Finally, there is no description of illness, death or funeral. A *consolatio* for someone who has died more than 30 years ago is also without parallel. We should conclude that II 7 is a species of the *genethliacon*, which derives a part of its originality from the fact that St. has mixed elements of a *consolatio* into it[4].

That Lucan was a poet prompts St. to many innovations in the *genre* of the *genethliacon* and is an important factor in the structure of the poem. At the beginning St. invokes not the *Genius* or *Natalis*, but the deities of poetry (1-23). And at the end he invokes, instead of divinities belonging to a birthday, Lucan himself (120), the *chori sacerdos* (22), who has become *sacer et superbus* (116); the *Genius* of Lucan and the dead Lucan coincide; altars are dressed for him (16-7) and he is worshipped (135).

St. introduces another speaker for the *laudatio*, and this is the Muse Calliope (at 41 ff.). This is because St. wants first of all to praise the great poet Lucan; he introduces the catalogue of Lucan's work, known in other kinds of poetry, into the *genethliacon*.

Nisbet (1978, 11) eloquently sketches the contrast between St. and Lucan: the one a Stoic, the other an Epicurean; the poet of the Civil War and the poet of the War with the Germans; one of precocious maturity

[4] Lohrisch (69), Vollm. (373), Cesareo (118) and Fr. (86 n. 1) are wrong in considering II 7 as a kind of λόγος ἐπιτάφιος, see also Buchheit 1960, 241. Newmyer (25-6, 75-6) is right in noticing the elements of the *genethliacon* and the *consolatio* but he puts too much stress on the *consolatio*: his contention that the poem has consolatory divisions (*exordium* 1-35, *laudatio* and *lamentatio* 36-106, *consolatio* 107-35) cannot fully be upheld. What he calls *exordium* consists of two parts: invocation (1-23) and praise (24-35). Its theme is completely different from that of the *exordium* of a *consolatio*. Because Newmyer follows Baucom's scheme for the *epicedium*, which is inferior to E.-F.'s (see II 1 *Intr.*), he attaches little importance to the omission of the descriptions. See also II 5 *Intr.*

and the other of premature elderliness; one born in brash Cordoba, the other in effete Naples; Lucan's relentlessly thumping hexameters against Sts.' technical skill. Yet I think that *tanti auctoris reverentiam* (II *Praef.* 26-7) is no hollow phrase: St. was more than good enough as a poet to recognize Lucan's power, and the author of the Thebaid must have admired Lucan's pathos.

II. Another consequence of Lucan's being a poet is the metre of II 7: St. says that he does not dare to compete with Lucan's hexameters (II *Praef.* 28). St. composed II 7 in hendecasyllables. This makes him the first poet to treat a lofty subject in this metre, together with Mart. VI 28 on the death of Glaucias (II 1 *Intr.*). But this last poem is much shorter and, like Catullus' serious poetry in hendecasyllables, not as sublime in style as II 7. The other long and serious poem in this metre before Ausonius is *Silv.* IV 3 *Via Domitiana.* We can not be completely certain, however, that St. innovates here, for the hendecasyllabic metre had a great vogue with the Neoterics and in the early Empire[5]. But of poets other than Catul., Mart. and St. only fragments (or nothing) has reached us.

Both St. and Mart. invariably have a spondaic base in their hendecasyllables[6], a restriction which Catullus does not admit. St. assumes a greater license than Catul. in his handling of the *caesura* in I 6, II 7, IV 3 and IV 9. The caesura regularly falls after the 5th or (mostly) 6th syllable in this metre. But in St. this is not the case in 36 out of 456 lines, against 11 out of 496 in Catul., *cf.* Friedländer on Mart. pp. 28-30, Crusius-Rubenbauer 103 ff., Fr. 168 n. 1. In *Silv.* II 7 there is no such caesura in 8, 25, 32, 50, 57, 64, 69, 80, 82, 87, 93, (94), (105), 115, 123, 132.

From the fact that St. chooses hendecasyllables here it seems to follow that Lucan did not use them in his *Silvae,* see Vollm. at II *Praef.* 28-30.

The metre also has a closure-function here. St. employs it in I 6 and IV 9, both Saturnalia-poems, which close their book and in IV 3, which closes the 'Domitian-cycle', IV 1-3. In this book hendecasyllables come at the end in a poem on a theme which is related to the many funerary poems, but is more optimistic. Moreover, II 1 and II 6 in a sense frame the second book as *consolationes*, enclosing poems on the theme nature-culture. II 7 treats an important subject: a poet and Roman (20-3n.) poetry. See *General Introduction* § 3, Vollm. 12, Fr. XXVI, Cancik 1965, 16-20, Delarue, RPh. 1974, 299 n. 5, Newmyer 45 ff.[7].

---

[5] For an enumeration of poets working in it, see L. Havet, *Cours élémentaire de métrique grecque et latine* (Paris 1893[3]) § 407.

[6] But their contemporaries did not necessarily adhere to this rule, see Plin. *Ep.* I 16, 5 and L. Müller, *De re metrica* (Petropoli/Lipsiae 1894[2]), 179.

[7] There is nothing on this point in Brożek 1970.

III. The structure of the poem is relatively obvious: **1)** Introduction (1-23), **2)** Praise (24-106), **3)** Epilogue (107-35). But other divisions are also valid: Calliope and her speech, 36-106, form the centre of the poem, enclosed by an introduction and an epilogue. This can be viewed as a division into **1)** Present (1-35), **2)** Past moving into present (36-106), **3)** Present and future (107-35), see Newmyer 76. However, this is not wholly without difficulties: The present of 1-23 is different from that of 24-35 (introduction of the poem and announcement of its subject 1-23, the poem itself, beginning with praise of Lucan's *patria*, 24-35). The 'future' in the last part is only represented by *adoret* (135), and that returns, as Newmyer says (80), to the beginning of the poem, *diem frequentet* (1), *colitur* (23). The treatment of Calliope consists of **a)** introduction (36-40), **b)** praise of Lucan's poetry (41-80), **c)** praise of Polla, (81-8), **d)** lament for Lucan (89-104), **e)** epilogue (105-6).

IV. The poem was commissioned by Lucan's widow Polla Argentaria, see II *Praef.* 24-6. She is also mentioned in Mart. VII 21, 2 and 23, 4, X 64, 1 *regina Polla*, which implies that she patronized poets, see Nisbet 1978, 2.

A passage in Sidonius about Polla has given rise to much speculation about her: *Carm.* 23, 165-6 *quid quos duplicitus iugata taedis/Argentaria pallidat poetas.* Sid. says that Polla married twice and seems to imply that her second husband was St. (this follows from the context where she is mentioned; Sid. alludes to Ovid, both Senecas and Martial). If Sid. means this, it is probable that he inferred it from Sts.' words to his wife in III 5, 51 ff. *sic certe cineres umbramque priorem/quaeris adhuc, sic exequias amplexa canori/coniugis ingentes iterasti pectore planctus,/iam mea.* Whoever the *canorus coniunx* of Sts.' wife was before she married him, it was not Lucan, if only because her name is Claudia (III *Praef.* 23).

That Polla remarried after Lucan's death is denied by *PIR* I n° 1039, *RE* II 706, Fr. 54 n. 7. And Sidonius' mistake can be explained so easily that it is probable that she only married once. But a second marriage is not impossible. As Nisbet says (1978, 4), St. does not say that she is *univira* and the main objection of scholars against the idea is sentimental: her fidelity to Lucan is emphasized in 124 ff. It is also possible that Lucan was her second husband.

The old theory that Polla's second husband was Pollius Felix and that she is identical with the Polla of II 2 (10, 147 ff.), III 1 (87, 159, 179) and IV 8 (14) was recently defended again by Nisbet 1978 (already proferred by Barth, accepted cautiously by Markland, rejected in *RE* II 706, ignored in recent editions and commentaries). His arguments do not go beyond showing that this possibility can not be completely ruled out: **1)**

she had the right age for it (but her age can not be determined exactly, see II 2 *Intr.*). **2)** There is only one distinguished Argentarius, the declamator (often in Sen. *Con.*, see *RE* I 2228). He might be Polla's grandfather. Lucan, as a rhetoric poet, might marry the granddaughter of a declaimer, and this granddaughter of the Hellenized Argentarius (Sen. *Con.* IX 3, 12) might well marry the Hellenophile Pollius Felix (II 2, 72-97n.). **3)** II 2, 150 ff. pun on Polla's name Argentaria (see note there). This is Nisbet's central argument: it would be strange if St. mentions two Pollas in one book and employs the banking vocabulary only for a Polla who is not named Argentaria. But one wonders why he did not pun on her name in II 7. Nisbet sees a similar pun in III 1, 158-60 where Polla Pollii is associated with the apples of the Hesperides: gold/silver. But 'gold' is not mentioned there. **4)** If the Pollas are identical, the order of the poems in *Silv.* II is more convincing: 1 and 6 belong together and so would 2 and 7 do. This is a strange argument, for it implies that St. ordered his poems not according to the addressees or chief persons, but to their wives. See also II *Praef.* 23-8 (footnote).

V. Mart. VII 21, 22, 23 also treat of the dead Lucan and were ordered by Polla (21, 2 *Polla*, 23, 3 *Polla*). Buchheit (1961) has shown that they form a cycle and that they are Martial's original solution of the problem 'how to write a *genethliacon* when you are an epigrammatist'. The verbal resemblances between Mart. and St. are better explained by the shared subject and *genre* than as criticism or correction by one of the poets of the other one (*cf.* Buchheit 1960, 245-6 against Heuvel, II 1 *Intr.*, II 1, 72-5n., II 6, 44-6n.).

Polla ordered poetry from two (or perhaps more) poets at the same time. Buchheit suggests (1960, 231 n. 3) that it may have been Lucan's 50th anniversary, but this is, as he himself grants, very improbable: St. and Mart. would certainly have mentioned the fact and II *Praef.* 26 *cum hunc diem forte consuleremus* is against it. Lucan's 50th birthday was in 89 and Mart. VII is from 90-2 A.D.

VI. *Silv.* II 7 is transmitted in M and its descendants, but also separately in L, the 10th century *cod. Laur. plut.* 29, 32, between several small technical and religious pieces, see Klotz *ed.* VII-VIII, Mar. *ed.* VII-VIII. But L and M do not represent different traditions; they have the same ancestor, see Frère 1943 LXXVIII-LXXXIII, Traglia *ed.* V-VI (Baehrens suspected already a connection between the *Itali* and L before M was discovered: *ed.* XI). Politian knew L and collated it with his manuscript, see Klotz *ed.* LIII-IV, Mar. *ed.* LX ff., *General Introduction* § 5.

Titulus: In L and M the poem is superscribed *Genethliacon Lucani ad Oppiam.* Politian corrected it into *Pollam,* see II *Praef.* 25, lines 60, 120 here and Mart. VII 21, 2 and 23, 3, X 64, 1.

For the word *genethliacon* see II *Praef.* 23-8n.

1-23. Introduction: It consists of three parts framing a 'central panel' (see Newmyer 75-6): 1-4 and 19-23 state that its subject is Lucan (*Lucani* 1, *Lucanum* 19). The final lines add a sacral tone to the first four ones (19 *favete linguis,* 23 *colitur, sacerdos*): Lucan is the poet-prophet, who inspires a religious awe. In the central part, St. invokes the deities of poetry (5-8, announced by the general exhortation in 1) and instructs for preparation of the festivities (9-18).

St. refers obliquely to birthday customs, to make clear that this is a *genethliacon*: mention of the day (1), white clothes (10), the dressing of altars (16-7).

Note the solemn, hymn-like style in the invocations and cult-titles (5-11n.).

1-4. Lucani proprium diem frequentet: On naming the addressee or subject of the poem in the beginning, see II 1, 1-3n., II 6, 10-12n. This is Sts.' only poem where the name is the first word, but see II 4, 1 *psittace,* V 3, 1 *ipse,* V 5, 1 *me.*

The day is invariably mentioned in birthday-poetry: Tib. I 7, 1, II 2, 1, III 12, 3 and 13, 1, Prop. III 10, 3, Ov. *Tr.* III 13, 1-2, V 5, 1, Mart. VII 21, 1 and 22, 1, IX 52, 2, X 24, 1, Sid. *Carm.* 17, 3, *cf.* the 'pseudo-*genethliaca*', Hor. *Carm.* IV 11, 15, Pers. 2, 1, *Silv.* IV 7, 31, *AP* VI 227, 321, IX 349. The day returns at the end of the introduction (20) and at the end of the poem (121).

For the birthday defined as *dies* + genitive or possessive pronoun, see Mart. IV 1, 1 *Caesaris alma dies,* Cic. *Att.* XIII 42, 2 *diem meum scis esse III Non.Ian.*, Vollm., 20-4n.

On the gender of *dies,* see II 1, 222-6n.

frequentare, like *celebrare,* is both 'to celebrate' (*OLD* 7a, e.g. Ov. *Met.* III 691 *Bacchea...sacra frequento*) and 'to attend' (*ibid.*, e.g. Suet. *Aug.* 31, 4 *nocturnum spectaculum frequentare*).

quisquis...bibit...liquorem: St. invokes everyone who is connected with poetry, see II 4, 16-7n., E.-F. 126 § 1, and below.

collibus Isthmiae Diones: 'The hills of the Isthmian Aphrodite' = Akrokorinth. Dione in Greek poetry since Homer was Aphrodite's mother. She is identified once with Aphrodite, in Theocr. 7, 116 (see Gow's note). This Hellenistic identification is frequent in Latin, since

Catul. 56[8], e.g. Ov. *Fast.* V 309 (see Bömer), Petr. 133, 3, VFl. VII 187, Sil. IV 106, see *RE* V 878-80 and Nisbet-H. on Hor. *Carm.* II 1, 39.

In St. Dione is Aphrodite in I 1, 84, *Th.* I 288 (see Heuvel), *Ach.* II 54. He employs *Dionaeus* for 'of Aphrodite' in III 5, 80 and *Th.* VII 161[9].

The whole expression means 'Akrokorinth', because Aphrodite had a famous temple there, with a thousand prostitutes. The whole top of the hill was sacred to her, see Strabo VIII C 379, Paus. II 5, 1, *RE Suppl.* IV 1001-2, 1006, *Suppl.* VI 192, Fr. 86 n. 2.

docto pectora concitatus oestro: 'With hearts fired by poetic frenzy'. *concitatus*: KQ, followed by all editors, *concitavit*: LM. *Concitavit...bibit* gives a very harsh asyndeton, with change of tense. For *concitatus pectora*, see e.g. Lucr. I 13 *perculsae corda*, Verg. *G.* IV 357 *percussă...mentem formidine, A.* VIII 29 *turbatus pectora bello*, Hor. *S.* II 3, 295 *animum concussus*, Sil. VIII 242 *instincti pectora, LHSz.* 36-8, Flobert 870-1.

On *doctus* for 'poetic', see II 2, 118-20n. *Oestrus* (Greek οἶστρος) means 'gad-fly', and is used metonymically for 'frenzy' before St., e.g. *Ciris* 184, Sen. *Oed.* 443. But St. is the first, and virtually the only one, to say it of poetic frenzied inspiration, also at *Th.* I 32 *Pierio...oestro* (Lact.Plac. there: *instinctus, stimulus, furor*). St. is imitated by Nem. *Cyn.* 3-4 *Aonio...pectus ab oestro aestuat.* See *TLL* IX² 483, 53 ff.

concitatus oestro is a contrast with *docto.* St. alludes to the two conflicting views of poetry: one which regards it as a kind of divine frenzy, ἐνθουσιασμὸς καὶ ἱερὸν πνεῦμα (Democr. B 21, DK), like Horace's *male sanus poeta*; the other view is that of poetry as *ars* and *labor limae*, see Hor. *Ars* 295 ff., 455 ff., Kroll 1924, 24-43, Brouwers 84 n. 53, 122, 154. St. wants to fuse the inspired and the learned trend here (*cf.* also 19 ff. and 76), see Dams 165-6.

doctus returns in 12, 46, 76, 83. This is no 'unconscious iteration' (Jones 19-22), but II 7 is a poem about poetry as well as about a dead poet: 1-23, 31-5, 42-53, 73-81, apart from the catalogue of Lucan's works in 54 ff., all contain literary criticism.

pendentis bibit ungulae liquorem: 'drinks the water of the flying horse'. For drinking sacred water as a symbol for poetic activity, see II 2, 36-42n.

St. alludes to the fountain Peirene, made on the Akrokorinth by Pegasus, see II 2, 36-42n. under 3).

For *ungula*, hoof, for horse, see II 2, 38-9n. For *pendere*, to fly, see I 2, 45 *pensa veheret Titania biga, Th.* III 505 and Snijder, VIII 10, IX 285, *OLD* 8a. In II 2, 37-8 St. says *volantis...ungula...equi*, in II 3, 13 he says *suspensa.*

---

[8] It is a conjecture in Pl. *Mil.* 1414.

[9] Both under *Diomedeus* in the Concordance.

5-11. Ipsi quos penes est honor canendi: St. now invokes specifically the divinities of poetry, Hermes, Dionysus, Apollo and the Muses, *cf.* Mart. VII 23, 1 *Phoebe veni.* For Sts.' habit of invoking divine inspiration, see II 3, 6-7n. The same or similar authorities occur at I 2, 3-6 and 17-8, I 4, 19-21 (with Pallas), I 5, 1-5, V 1, 25-6.

The habit of invocation occurs in a hymn-like style, see Lucr. I 1 ff. (and C. Bailey 591), Verg. *G.* I 1 ff. But most of Sts.' poems are not hymn-like. Here, however this association is reinforced by the construction *ipse quos* and the attributes: in hymns the name of the god is followed by a relative clause, which predicates his cult-place or power-sphere, like here (except that the order is different). For St. see also IV 8, 45 ff. *di patrii, quos...tu ductor...tuque...et vos, Th.* VIII 303 ff. The combination of a vocative (*Euhan*, also *Arcas*) with an attribute in apposition (*citharae repertor...Bassaridum rotator*) is also common in hymns and prayers, e.g. Sappho 1, 1 ποικιλόθρον' ἀθανάτ' Ἀφροδίτα, Catul. 34, 5-6 *o Latonia, maxima progenies Iovis*, Hor. *Carm.* I 10, 1, *Th.* IV 826 *silvarum, Nemea...regina*, see Norden 1912, 152, 168 ff., esp. 172-4 and Nisbet-H. on Hor. *Carm.* I 10, 1, Versnel 1977, 368-9 and the literature in n. 18.

ipsi is a specification of *quisquis*, the (great) gods themselves.

penes refers to power or sovereignty, see Fest. p. 20 (L.): **apud** *et* **penes** *in hoc differunt quod alterum personam cum loco significat alterum personam et dominium ac potestatem*, Brink on Hor. *Ars* 72, *LHSz.* 239, also for its postposition with pronouns.

St. has a peculiar preference for *penes*: of all poets between Lucr. and Juv. he has it by far most frequently, 9 times, followed by 5 occurrences in Sen. trag. and 3 in Ov. The word has an archaic flavour (see II 3, 12-4n.). It is equally rare in all kinds of poetry. In the *Silv.* it occurs twice: here and in I 4, 16.

honor canendi: 'the (high) office of song' (see *OLD* 5a). For *honor* instead of *honos*, see II 1, 52-4n. For the phrase *cf.* Hor. *Ars* 72 *quem penes arbitrium est et ius et norma loquendi.*

vocalis citharae repertor Arcas: *Arcas* is Mercury, the Arcadian god, see II 1, 189-90n. This name for him occurs since Lucan (IX 661 *Arcados auctoris citharae*). In St. it also occurs in III 3, 80, V 1, 107, *Th.* IV 229, 483.

He is a god of poetry because he invented the lyre on the day of his birth: *h. Merc.* 30 ff., Paus. V 14, 8, Apollod. III 10, 2, *cf.* Hor. *Carm.* I 10, 6 (with Nisbet-H.), Ov. *Fast.* V 104 (with Bömer).

For *vocalis*, melodious, *cf.* Tib. II 5, 3 *vocalis...chordas.* Elsewhere in the *Silv.* it rather means 'connected with poetry': I 2, 6, V 3, 209, V 5, 2. In *Th.* I 492 it means 'speaking'.

et tu Bassaridum rotator Euhan: 'And you, Bacchus, who makes the Maenads swirl'. A *Bassaris* is a Bacchante. The word is derived from Dionysus' cult-title *Bassareus* (possibly connected with the Thracian word for wolf or fox), see *OLD*, Nisbet-H. on Hor. *Carm.* I 18, 9. The word, like *Euhan* (below), suggests orgiastic frenzy (*cf.* on 3 above) and is high-flown, *cf.* the mockery in Pers. 1, 99-102 *torva mimalloneis implerunt cornua bombis/et raptum vitulo caput ablatura superbo/Bassaris et lyncem Maenas flexura corymbis/euhian ingeminat, reparabilis adsonat Echo*, Sen. *Oed.* 432, Prop. III 17, 30 (*Bassaricus*).

rotator is first used by St. here, and only once after him, in a different sense, at Cassiod. *Var.* VII 5, 5 *camerum rotator*, see Schamberger 261, Speranza 1956, 41. St. invented relatively few words in *-tor*, though they are popular in poetry and many new nouns with this suffix are coined by other Silver poets, see Schamberger 260.

For Bacchus' making the Maenads turn, see *Th.* VII 169-71 *turba meas acies, mea tantum proelia norunt, nectere fronde comas et ad inspirata rotari buxa.*

The title *Euhan* occurs since Lucr. V 743[10]. On its origin, see Bömer on Ov. *Met.* IV 15, Mulder on *Th.* II 72, Versnel 1970, 27-31. It is frequent in St.: 13 times (*Euhius* 3).

As a god of poetry Bacchus is mainly the god who inspires (see on 3). In Greek poetry already he is found leading the Muses: Solon 20, Soph. *Ant.* 963, Call. *frg.* 191, 7. In Latin poetry he is as important as Apollo: Prop. II 30, 38 (see Rothstein), III 2, 7, IV 1, 62, *cf.* III 3, 33 ff. His original function is still clear in Hor. *Carm.* II 19 (see Nisbet-H.'s Intr.), III 25, *Ep.* II 2, 77. *Cf.* Ov. *Am.* I 3, 11 *Phoebus comitesque novem vitisque repertor, Tr.* V 3, 1. In St. he occurs together with Apollo at I 2, 220, here and V 3, 5.

Bacchus is important in the *genethliacon* as a god of wine and social enjoyment, see Cairns 1972, 168.

Paean: Originally a healing divinity independent of Apollo (already mentioned in Linear B), the two are identified since the Homeric hymn to Apollo. In Latin *Paean* is a frequent synonym for *Apollo* since Ov. *Ars* II 1, see Bömer on *Fast.* IV 263. In St. it occurs at I 2, 2, *Th.* I 636, X 343.

Hyantiae sorores: The Muses. *Hyantius* is a rare word for Boeotian, *cf.* Plin. *Nat.* IV 26 *Boetos Hyantas antiquitus dixere.* It is found since Ov., both as *Hyantius* (*Met.* III 147, Sid. *Ep.* 8, 9 l. 1 *Hyantias Camenas, Carm.* 9, 284 *Phoebum vel Hyantias puellas*) and *Hyanteus* (*Met.* V 312, VIII 310, Mart. XII 2, 12, Serv. on *A.* III 88. In St.: *Th.* I 183, see Heuvel), see Bömer on *Met.* III 147, *RE* IX 24 n° 1.

---

[10] In Enn. *Scen.* 122 *euhan* is obelized by Jocelyn.

Hyantiae is a correction by Poliziano (1978) for *eu(h)antiae* (mss.).

For the connection of the Muses with Boeotia and of Apollo with the Muses (I 2, 3, IV 2, 56, IV 7, 21, V 3, 91, 122, V 5, 3, *Th.* VI 333, VIII 374), see II 2, 36-42n.

For *sorores*, see I 2, 10, V 3, 121-2 *sorores Aonides*, V 5, 3-4 *sorores Pieriae, Th.* IX 317 *doctae...sorores*, II 1, 185n.

The Muses are 'not germane to the genre' of the *genethliacon* (Cairns 1971, 154). Prop. (III 10, 1-2) introduces them to stress his own role as a poet, St. to stress Lucan's role as such.

For the caesura, see *Intr.* under **II.**

laetae purpureas novate vittas, crinem comite candidamque vestem: The Muses are urged to deck themselves in new, purple fillets, do their hair and take white dresses.

They are *laetae*, because of the birthday, see Prop. III 10, 7, Ov. *Tr.* III 13, 20, Cairns 1971, 149-51. The word corresponds only with the Muses in gender because they are the last-named divinities, and St. elaborates on the last member of an enumeration, see II 1, 184-8n. Saenger supposed a lacuna, both because he missed a word like *ades* and because he wanted to make clear that *laetae* goes only with *sorores.* He filled this *exempli gratia* with *Paean(ades huc genisque Pallas/nudatis; at) Hyantiae sorores.*

On the *vitta*, see II 1, 26-8n. Here the *vittae* are purple, which is strange, for their usual colour was white, by far the most important symbolic colour in Roman religion, see Cic. *Leg.* II 18, 45, André 1949, 30-1, 366.

The explanation can have two aspects: **1)** purple *vittae* are not impossible, **2)** the *vittae* are purple because they belong to Bacchus, like *hedera* (below).

1) A purple *vitta* occurs at *Ciris* 511 (*cf.* Catul. 64, 309 *roseae*), Sen. *Thy.* 686 *maesta vitta capita purpurea legat* and twice in St.: here and at *Ach.* I 611 *cinxit purpureis flaventia tempora vittis*, Tert. *Ap.* 15 *sub...vittis et apicibus purpureis*, see also Wunderlich 60. In *Th.* II 738 a purple and white *vitta* occurs, *nectent purpureas niveo discrimine vittas.* Serv. on *A.* X 538 says of the *vitta*: *plerumque tortilis, de albo et cocco*, which is explained as 'either white, or purple' (*Kleine Pauly* II 409). See also Sid. *Ep.* VIII, 11, 4 *virente vitta. Purpureus* is essentially a colour of joy, see Ov. *Tr.* I 1, 6, André 1949, 102, 261. This explanation of the purple *vitta* is in itself sufficient.

2) In *Ach.* I 611 these *vittae* are connected with Bacchus (593 *orgia Bacchi*, 609-10 *demisit nebrida collo errantesque sinus hedera collegit*). Perhaps St. thinks of purple also in I 2, 248-9 *eat enthea vittis atque hedera redimita cohors*, and I 5, 13 *procax vittis hederisque* (thus Vollm. there). Why Bacchus and purple should be connected is less obvious. Bacchus as a god is called

candidus ([Tib.] III 6, 1, Ov. *Fast.* III 372), *viridis* (Aus. 126, 162 P.) and *roseus* (Ennod. II 67, 3). It seems much too far-fetched to think of the intricate connection between red as an important colour in Roman religion, the Greek Dionysus and the Roman triumph (see André 1949, 261, Versnel 1970 *passim*, e.g. 78 ff., 235 ff., 289 ff., Wunderlich 59-60, 82-4 on red clothes for (statues of) gods, e.g. Dionysus and his throng in Athen. V 194 ff.). The most simple but not completely satisfactory solution is the association of *purpureus* with grapes and wine (e.g. Lucil. 1288 (Krenkel), Prop. III 17, 17, Ov. *Met.* III 485, *cf.* Soph. *Oed.* 210 οἰνῶπα Βάκχον).

Fr. (87 n. 1) says: '*La mélange des deux inspirations apollinienne et dionysiaque...robe blanche, mais bandelettes de pourpre et festons de lierre*'. Even leaving apart the post-Nietzschean wording, this seems too specific: there is no reason why white should belong to Apollo rather than to Roman ritual in general (see also below) and the connection of Bacchus with purple appears to be tenuous. The only clear allusion to a specific god is *hedera*, see below. St. often combines *purpureus* and *candidus* or similar words, see II 1, 41n., II 2, 85-9n.

novare means 'to replace with another of the same kind' (*OLD* 2a). Vollm. explains this in the same vein as Fr.: '*legt die weisse Priesterbinde...ab und schmückt sich mit den Abzeichnen des Bacchus, purpurner Binde und Efeu*' (on I 5, 13). But this can hardly be what St. means with *novare*, for Bacchus, Apollo and other gods are on equal footing here, while in I 5 St. *ludit* (14). *Novate* must rather imply that they already wore purple fillets and now take fresh ones (the simplest explanation anyway). In the same spirit they also do their hair, and take fresh ivy.

candidam: it was the custom to wear white clothing at a birthday: Ov. *Tr.* III 13, 13-4 *scilicet expectas solitum tibi moris honorem/pendeat ex umeris vestis ut alba meis*, V 5, 8, Hor. *S.* II 61. The origin of the custom is religious, but it became simply a sign of joy (André 1949, 38).

Like others before him, St. combines this custom with the notion 'joyful' which had become inherent in *candidus*: Tib. I 7, 63-4 *at tu, Natalis...candidior semper candidiorque veni*, Ov. *Tr.* V 5, 13-4 *optime Natalis...candidus huc venias.*

perfundant: 'Dangle (everywhere) on', *cf.* Sen. *Phaed.* 394 *sic temere iactae colla perfundunt comae*, 801-2, Nemes. *Ecl.* 3, 20 (*Bacchus*) *odoratis perfusus colla capillis.* Markland's *praecingant* is wrong.

hederae recentiores: Ivy has an age-old place in Dionysiac ritual, perhaps an older one than the vine even, see Dodds on Eur. *Bacch.* 81, Var. *L.* VI 14 *sacerdotes Liberi anus hedera coronatae*, Plin. *Nat.* XVI 144.

recentiores: St., like Catul., here employs the comparative instead of the positive for metrical reasons, e.g. Catul. 3, 2 *hominum venustiorum*, 9, 10;

10, 24; 12, 3, see Kroll on Catul. 3, *LHSz.* 169. St. does it in 109 below, 127, I 6, 32, 64.

For the Muses decked with ivy, *cf.* Ov. *Met.* V 338, *Fast.* V 79, Todd 43 n. 1.

9-11 are imitated by Sid. *Ep.* VIII 11, 4. 6 *sparsam stringe comam virente vitta/et rugas tibi syrmatis profundi/succingant hederae expeditiores.*

12-5. amnes...silvae: Curtius (101 ff.) claims that St. makes an extensive use of the invocation of Nature (101 ff. treat the history of this *topos*). But he quotes only three passages for this contention, III 4, 102 (which is not really an invocation), IV 8, 1-14 (which do not really speak about Nature) and this passage. But here St. rather mentions poetic symbols. For Sts.' attitude to Nature, see II 1, 82-6n., II 2 *Intr.* and II 3 *Intr.*

Docti largius evagentur amnes: Let the fountains of poetry flow more widely. For *docti*, see 2-4n. The *docti amnes* are the fountains on Mount Helicon, the mountain of the Muses, see II 2, 36-42n. and II 2, 36n., II 3, 1-5n. They must overflow in honour of Lucan.

largius, like *plus* in 13, is a real (hyperbolic) comparative.

For *evagari*, to overflow, see Plin. *Nat.* X 94, XIII 71, XVIII 167.

plus Aoniae virete silvae: For *Aonius*, Boeotian = poetical, see II 4, 19-23n. The woods are also mentioned at IV 4, 90 *silva Heliconide.*

et, si qua patet aut diem recepit,...umbra: 'Or if the foliage is open anywhere and admits the daylight'. This is m's reading. L has *paterant* and M *patera ut*, which are both meaningless. Many conjectures have been made, because Markl. contended that *aut* for *vel* is wrong: *patulam* (Markl., accepted by Phill. For its improbability, see II 1, 222-6n.), *laceram* (Baehrens), *patet ac* (Postgate 1905, 125), *platanus* (Saenger), *aut luem* (Damsté 1923, 155).

Vollm. and Helm (see Fr. *app.*) have defended *aut*, on the wrong grounds: they make a difference between *patet* and *diem recepit*, according to the way a spectator looks: up (*patet*) or down (*recepit*). This is apparently accepted by Fr. (*app.*).

But, though *aut* as a straightforward synonym for *et* is late (*TLL* II 1575, 72 ff.), in Pl. it *addit rem sententiamve non diversam ab antecedente, sed ut placet melius vel accuratius definitam* (*TLL* II 1564, 77 ff.), which is the case here. Moreover, in poetry since Augustus the difference between *et, aut* and *vel* is disappearing and two or three of them are often combined arbitrarily, e.g. *Th.* IV 422 *haud...ve...aut*, VI 608, VII 347 *qui...aut...que*, II 1, 117, II 2, 67, III 3, 130 *que...aut*, see *TLL* II 1570, 48-1571, 50, *LHSz.* 499-500.

For *umbra*, foliage, see II 3, 51-2n.

sertis mollibus expleatur: The sacred wood where the day-light does not enter is a well-known *topos*, e.g. Verg. *A.* VI 138-9, Ov. *Met.* X 90 ff. (with Bömer), Sen. *Oed.* 530 ff. St. has it also in *Th.* I 361-3 *rapiunt antiqua procellae/bracchia silvarum, nullisque aspecto per aevum/solibus umbrosi patuere aestiva Lyaei*, II 530-1, IX 591-2, see also Luc. III 443-4 *tum primum posuere comas et...admisere diem* (*arbores*), Aus. *Mos.* 14-5 (and Pavlovskis 1973, 34).

St. here introduces a variation on the theme: if light enters, it must be excluded, for the woods are sacred (to poetry). But this must be done with garlands, *sertis*. These belong to the birthday: Natalis wears a garland (Tib. I 7, 52, II 2, 6) and altars are decked with garlands (Prop. III 10, 19, Ov. *Tr.* III 3, 15, V 5, 10). St. keeps the attributes, but makes the atmosphere extra-solemn: he takes the garlands and the altars apart and employs the garland in the *topos* of the sacred wood and the altars in a hecatomb (below).

16-8. Centum...odora...stent altaria victimaeque centum: Altars where scents are burnt, usually incense, (*odora*) are invariably mentioned in the *genethliacon*: Prop. III 10, 19, Tib. I 7, 53, II 2, 3-4, III 11, 9 and 12, 1, Ov. *Tr.* III 13, 15-6, V 5, 11, Mart. X 24, 5.

Here St. mentions also bulls (or cows) to be sacrificed, *victimae* (for this meaning of *victima*, see Cic. *Div.* I 119, *Fest.* 371 b 6, *RE Suppl.* V 239). This is surprising, for Varro expressly says that all sacrifices at a birthday are unbloody and slaughtering does not occur in other *genethliaca*: Cens. *Die Natali* II 2, *Varro testatur...ut cum die natali munus annale genio solverent* (*maiores nostri*) *manum a caede ac sanguine abstinerent, ne die qua ipsi lucem accepissent alii demerent.* Perhaps this was an old-fashioned rule, or one that only concerned the person whose birthday it was, for Horace promises to slaughter a lamb for Maecenas' birthday (*Carm.* IV 11, 7-8). But St. wants also to break the bounds of the *genethliacon*.

Centum is often a hyperbole in Latin poetry, and means 'many', see Verg. *A.* I 416 *centum arae*, IV 199 with Pease, Enk on Grat. 17, Heuvel on *Th.* I 103 and Mulder on II 736 *centum...aris.* This use of *centum* is found esp. in religious contexts. But this does not alter the fact that St. refers to a hecatomb for Lucan, a sacrifice of 100 bulls, which was virtually confined to pompous ceremonies of state, see *RE Suppl.* V 262-3, Mayor on Juv. 12, 101. Sts.' praise of Lucan is very hyperbolic here. See also Sil. XIII 333 *altaria fument centum festa Iovi, centum cadat hostia cultris.*

Thespiacis...lucis...Dirce...Cithaeron: The geography again evokes Apollo, the Muses and Dionysus, see 5-11n. *Thespiacis* refers to Apollo and the Muses: it is derived from *Thespiae*, a city at the foot of Mt. Helicon, see 2 *RE* VI 37 ff., 45 ff., Snijder at *Th.* III 14, II 2, 36-42n.

For its connection with Apollo, see Serv. on *A.* VII 641 *Cithaeronem Liberi et Heliconem Apollinis.* It points esp. to the Muses: Var. *L.* VII 70 *Thespiades deae: Musae, a Thespiis Boeotiae oppido*, Ov. *Met.* V 310 *Thespiades deae.*

Dirce is a fountain in the Theban region: Paus. IX 25, 3, Heuvel on *Th.* I 152, Mulder on II 322. It occurs frequently in the Thebaid. For its connection with Bacchus, see I 4, 21 *mitem...Dirces...hortabor alumnum.*

Mt. Cithaeron is the highest mountain of Boeotia, see Heuvel on *Th.* I 330, Mulder on II 80, Bömer on Ov. *Met.* III 702. It is sacred to Bacchus, see Serv. above, *Th.* II 80, IV 371 *bacchate Cithaeron*, VIII 346-7, Ov. *Met.* II 223, III 702-3 *electus facienda ad sacra Cithaeron/cantibus et clara bacchantum voce sonabat*, Sen. *Oed.* 484.

19. Lucanum canimus, favete linguis: *Favete linguis* is a well-known religious injunction: 'be silent', *cf.* Cic. *Div.* I 102 *rebus divinis quae publice fierent ut 'faverent linguis' imperabatur*, Hor. *Carm.* III 1, 2, Sen. *Dial.* VII 26, 7 *favete linguis. Hoc verbum imperat silentium*, Plin. *Nat.* XXVIII 11, see *TLL* VI[1] 376, 78 ff. *RE Suppl.* V 273-4. St. announces to the imaginary participants of the feast, the audience of his poem, that the subject is Lucan (1-23n.) and that this venerable subject forces them to awe-inspired silence. He emulates Hor. *Carm.* III 1, 2-4 *favete linguis: carmina non prius audita Musarum sacerdos* (see 23) *virginibus puerisque canto* (*canimus* here).

20. vestra est ista dies, favete, Musae: *Favere*, to be silent, is also used without *ore* or *linguis*: Fest. p. 78 (L.) *veteres poetae pro silere usi sunt favere*, Tib. II 2, 2, Sen. *Ep.* 52, 10 *tacete, favete.* But *favete, Musae* cannot mean 'ye Muses, keep silence' (Mozl.): St. could not command them in this way. Moreover, in 41 ff. he makes Calliope speak. And in ancient poetical theory the poet can only sing *because* the Muses dictate his words.

Favete here must rather mean 'be propitious' (Fr., Sb., Traglia-Ar.), a frequent wish in prayers, *cf.* Ov. *Fast.* III 714 *Bacche, fave vati*, IV 723, VI 249, Bömer on I 71, Mart. VII 22, 2 *Aonidum turba, favete sacris, OLD* 1b. For the different meanings of a word in succeeding lines, see II 2, 68-72n. (*cura*), II 3, 46-8n. In Mart. X 87, 3 the phrase has a double use too: *linguis omnibus et favete votis.*

vestra: *meus, tuus* etc. *dies* means 'an important day for me', see Sen. *Suas.* II 12 *hic meus est dixere dies* (Corn. Sev. *frg.* 11 Morel), Sen. *Med.* 1017, 1-4n. Here St. almost identifies Lucan with the Muses: it is Lucan's (birth)day (*cf.* 1n.) and, therefore, the day of the Muses.

For *ista*, see II 1, 141-2n.

21-3. dum qui vos geminas tulit per artes et vinctae pede vocis et solutae...colitur: *Dum*, 'because', an interpretation of the word which is sometimes necessitated by the context. It is already found in Pl. (e.g. *Trin.* 1149, *Rud.* 514), see also e.g. Catul. 65, 22, *Culex* 211-2, Mart. VII 13, 1, *LHSz.* 614-5, *TLL* V[1] 2202, 68 ff., 2208, 25 ff. *Dum* is not found with this implication elsewhere in *Silv.* II.

The general meaning of the lines is clear: Lucan is honoured because he wrote both poetry and prose. But Sts.' wording is singular: *tulit* is explained by Vollm. as 'who carried you' (the Muses). He thinks that St. may refer to portable images of the Muses, though he does not know '*ein ähnliches, für die Musen, passives, Bild*'. But even if he did know one, this sounds most improbable, and one wonders what *per artes* could mean in such a concrete context.

Mozl., Fr., Sb., and Traglia-Ar.[11] explain *tulit* as 'made glorious', *sublimem tulit*, see *TLL* VI[1] 544, 82 ff. But all the examples there have an adjunct like *in astra, ad aethera.*

I think that St. imitates Prop. III 1, 3-4 *primus ego ingredior puro de fonte sacerdos/Itala per Graios orgia ferre choros*, see *chori* and *sacerdos* in 23, also *Romani* for *Itala* and *tulit/ferre* (for Sts.' imitations of Propertius, see D.R.S. Bailey). But the explanation of *ferre* there is disputed (*cf.* e.g. Kroll 1924, 31 n. 20), and it is not certain that *ferre* in St. is the same as in Prop. *Ferre* here means 'to lead': Lucan has led the Muses through prose and poetry (like someone who leads a group of dancers), see (perhaps) *ferre choros* in Prop., Verg. *G.* III 10-1 *in patriam mecum... Aonio...deducam vertice Musas* (a different kind of leading), VFl. II 282 *non similes iam ferre choros...audet.* St. varies with *vos tulit...pede* on expressions like *pedem ferre* for dancing, see *OLD ferre* 3b, e.g. Hor. *Carm.* II 12, 17 *ferre pedem...choris*, Verg. *G.* I 11 *ferte simul Faunique pedem Dryadesque puellae.*

pede refers both to a metrical 'foot' and to a kind of stepping, step: I 2, 9, Ov. *Am.* III 1, 7 (both jokes about Elegy), *Silv.* V 3, 92 (the Muses) *quis labor Aonios seno pede ducere campos*: Lucan has led the Muses through both kinds of literature, with the step of poetry and that of prose.

pes is used for prose and poetry together also in V 3, 159-61 (Sts.' father rewrites Homer in metrically equivalent prose) *tu par assuetus Homero/ferre iugum senosque pedes aequare solutis/versibus, Paneg. Mess.* 36 *quique canent vincto pede quique soluto.*

For *vincire* for poetry, 'to bind' (by metre): V 3, 101-2 *sive orsa libebat/Aoniis vincire modis seu voce soluta*, see IV 4, 11 *inclusa modis verba.* For *soluta* (*oratio*, here *vox*, see above), prose, see also I 4, 28-30 *seu plana solutis*

---

[11] Clouard translates impossibly '*qui a reçu votre souffle*'.

cum struis orsa modis, seu cum tibi dulcis in artem frangitur...facundia, IV 5, 57-60. It occurs since Var. *L.* VII 2 p. 114 (Sp.[2]), see Krebs-Schmalz under *prosa*. For Lucan's prose, see on 60-1.

Romani...chori sacerdos: St. refers to the traditional view of the poet as a priest or prophet, *cf.* e.g. Prop. III 1, 3 (above) with Rothstein, IV 6, 1, Hor. *Carm.* I 31, 2 with Nisbet-H., III 1, 3, Ov. *Am.* III 8, 23, *Tr.* III 2, 3, Kroll 1924, 30 ff., below 51. Like Propertius (III 1, 3 ff.), Vergil (*G.* III 10, 11) and Horace (I 32, 3, III 30, 13 ff., IV 3, 23), Lucan is the priest of a Roman band of Muses.

Throughout II 7 Lucan is represented as a Latin poet *par excellence*, because of the subject of his chief poem, the *Bellum Civile*, see 34, 45-7, 52-3, 60-1, 64-72, 79-80, 113-5. This is in accordance with Lucan's own announcement (I 66) *Romana in carmina*. Thus Lucan joins the *poetae, qui...res Romanas scribunt* (Cic. *Man.* 25), *Romana ingenia* (Prop. I 7, 22), see Häussler 45-6 with note 65 and on 48-53 below.

24-35. Patria: The central speech of II 7 (41-106, introduced by 36-40), which is concerned with praise of Lucan's literary achievements, is framed by praise of his native country, southern Spain (24-35), and a description of Lucan in the Underworld (107-119).

Praise of one's *patria* occurs in *epicedia*: III 3, 60-2 *Smyrna tibi gentile solum potusque verendo fonte Meles*, V 3, 123-9, Aus. *Epic. in patrem* 3-4, *cf.* Verg. *A.* VI 176-7 *nec Romula quondam ullo se tantum tellus iactabat alumno*, E.-F. 132 § 13. St. praises *patria* also in other poems: II 2, 94 ff., 133 ff., III 4, 12 ff., III 5, 74 ff. See *Intr.* under **I.**

It is also a *topos* in the *laudatio funebris*: Schol. Cic. *Mil.* 7, 16 *in laudatione mortui Scipionis in cuius extrema parte haec verba sunt '...is cum illo animo atque ingenio hac e civitate potissimum natus est...'*. It also found its way into rhetoric theory: Quint. *Inst.* III 7, 10 *laus hominum...qui fato sunt functi... Ante hominem patria ac parentes maioresque erunt*, (Dionys.) *Ars* VI 2 (Us. 26, 18). In poetry it seems to be confined to St. This may mean that here he is inspired by rhetoric (rather than by the *laudatio funebris*, where the order is different), but it may be a *topos* from other kinds of poetry than funerary poetry.

The praise of *patria* is divided into **1)** the land (24-32), **2)** a river (with some associations: 33-5), just as in III 3, 60 ff. Between the two Lucan's relatives are mentioned (31-2). A reference to family is a *topos* from funerary poetry, see III 1, 115 *fratres*, Prop. III 18, 12, IV 11, 65-6, Aus. *Epic. in patrem* 41-51, *cf.* Cic. *De Orat.* II 46, E.-F. 133 § 18. The combination of it with praise of *patria*, is unusual. St. mentions family here, Seneca and Gallio, two uncles of Lucan, because they were also poets. Lucan's parents are not mentioned, because they wrote no literature,

and his fellow-countrymen Quintilian and Martial are omitted, because they are no family of Lucan.

The combination of praise of *patria* and authors born there is also found in Mart. I 61 *Verona docti syllabas amat vatis, Marone felix Mantua est...duosque Senecas unicumque Lucanum facunda loquitur Corduba...nec me tacebit Bilbilis.*

24-9. Felix heu nimis et beata tellus: Markland objected to *heu* (followed by Otto 1887, 535 and Merrill 99), because it appears virtually only in *re lugubri*. But this *laudatio* is in fact *lugubris*, and it is, just like in *epicedia*, mixed with *lamentatio* (see II 1 *Intr.*, 36-136n.). Here St. touches upon the commonplace of the *invidia deorum*, see 90-2, II 1, 120-4n., II 4, 3n., II 6, 68-70n.

heu nimis is rare (only Hor. *Carm.* I 2, 36, here, and Claud. *Carm.* 3, 50, see *TLL* VI[3] 2673, 56-61), but *heu nimium* is a common combination, see Pease on Verg. *A.* IV 657 *felix heu nimium felix*, Luc. VIII 139, *CE* 1347 A 17 *felix heu nimium felix dum vita maneret.* See also III 3, 25 *felix a nimium felix*, V 5, 59 *o nimium felix* and for *heu* II 1, 26-8n.

felix and *beata* are synonyms, see *TLL* VI[1] 449, 49, for *beatus*: II 6, 67; and for *felix* in connection with a country: II 2, 21-5n.

pronos Hyperionis meatus: 'The downward course of Hyperion', sunset. For *pronus* see *Th.* II 41 *prona dies* with Mulder ('*prona dicuntur sidera occidentia...praesertim sol*'), III 408 *sol pronus*, X 370, XII 307, *Ach.* I 689, Hor. *Carm.* III 27, 18, *al.*

Hyperion for the sun occurs since Hom. *Od.* I 24, but not as frequently in Greek as in Latin: Enn. *Ann.* 557 (V.), Ov. *Met.* VIII 565, *Fast.* I 385 with Bömer, *OLD* 1b, Grosz 397-9. In St. it occurs at III 1, 53, IV 4, 27, V 2, 55, *Th.* III 35, VIII 47, XI 120.

For the caesura, see *Intr.* under **II.**

summis...in undis: Just at the moment that the sun touches the water, *cf.* expressions like *summa aqua*, on the surface of the water, Cic. *Fin.* IV 23, 64, Verg. *A.* V 819, VI 357. Fr. takes it with *tellus*: '*terre...qui, à la marge des flots de l'Océan*'. Vollm. explains *summis* as 'the horizon', because that seems the highest point to a spectator. But that is a strange meaning for *summa unda* and St. wants to say that as soon as the sun touches the water, a sound is heard (below).

Oceani: Lucan was born in Cordoba, which is in the interior. But the province of Baetica where it is situated is on the Mediterranean and the Atlantic.

stridoremque rotae cadentis audis: The local Spanish tradition that the sun hissed when it touched the water, ψόφον ποιεῖν σβεννύμενον ὡς διάπυρον σίδηρον ἐν ὕδατι, was believed by Epicurus (Usener 354). It had a

vogue in Latin poetry: VFl. II 37, 63, Sil. I 210, Juv. 14, 280, Aus. *Ep.* 23, 2, Dracont. 10, 91. That the sun made a hissing sound when it emerged from the sluggish seas of the North is mentioned by Tac. *Germ.* 45, 1 and Dracont. 10, 31-2, see also *Th.* VIII 271-3 *cavam sub luce parata/Oceani mugire domum.*

For *rota* as a metonymy for 'chariot', see V 1, 17, *Th.* I 220, Ov. *Met.* I 448, *al.*, Sen. *Her.O.* 1439 *Phoebi rota, OLD* 1c, Lunderstedt 32. For *cadere*, to set, II 2, 45-7n.

quae Tritonide fertilis Athenas unctis, Baetica, provocas trapetis: Baetica vies with Athens in the production of olives, see Plin. *Nat.* XV 8 *reliquum certamen* (for the best olives after the Italian ones) *inter Istriae terram et Baeticam par est,* XVII 93, *Baetica...uberrimas messes inter oleas metit.* For the theme of rivalry, see II 2, 5 and 35 below. For *Baetica,* see II 3, 12-4n.

Tritonis is Pallas, see II 2, 116-7n. But here it is a synecdoche for the olive(-tree). This occurs apparently only once in Greek: *AP* XIV 53 (a riddle) Ἡφαίστῳ ποτε Πάλλας ἐν ἀγκοίνῃσι μιγεῖσα. It is more frequent in Latin: Ov. *Am.* II 16, 8 *baciferam Pallada,* Mart. VII 28, 3 *nec Tartessiacis Pallas tua, Fusce, trapetis cedat et immodici dent bona musta lacus, CE* 1552 A 28 *Palladis usu.* It means 'olive-oil' in Ov. *Tr.* IV 5, 4, *Ep.* 19, 44, *Aetna* 14 (see Goodyear there), *cf. Th.* VI 575 *Palladios haustus,* see Grosz 375-6.

For similar, frequent metonymies like Bacchus, wine, Vulcan, fire, see Quint. *Inst.* VIII 6, 24 *'Vulcanum' pro igne vulgo audimus,* Austin on Verg. *A.* I 177.

unctis trapetis 'with dripping olive-presses', they are *uncta,* because they are constantly used.

Lucanum potes imputare terris: 'You can claim credit for Lucan from the world'. For *imputare,* see *OLD* 3a, IV *Praef.* 16-7, Mart. X 30, 26. In II *Praef.* 26 it is used in a different sense. For the thought, *cf.* Mart. VII 22, 3-4 *haec meruit, cum te, Lucane, dedisset...Baetis.*

31-5.: Lucan is compared to two pairs of poets, his uncles (31-2) and the two most famous epic poets of antiquity, Homer and Vergil (33-5). This climax is the longer of the two comparisons. By those comparisons, St. leads up to Lucan's *Dichterweihe* in 36 ff. They imply high praise of Lucan, not disdain of his family or Vergil and Homer, see also below.

Hoc plus: (*est*). This is one of the harsher omissions of *est* and other forms of *esse* in St., see IV *Praef.* 32-3 *et quanto hoc plus est quam edere.* St. follows Vergil in omitting *est* much more often than writing it, whereas in Ov. the situation is reversed. In *Silv.* II St. omits *est* (*etc.*) 76 times and writes it 23 times (in I 79/20, in III 51/17, in IV 66/21. In Verg. *A.* I 50/20, II 80/20), see Winter 43 and 56-9, II *Praef.* 19-23n., II 2, 6-9n., II 6, 97-8n.

Senecam...dulcem...Gallionem: The two brothers of Lucan's father M. Annaeus Mela. From Sts.' mention of Seneca and not of Lucan's father, and from the two poets following, we should infer that Gallio also was a poet.

L. Annaeus Novatus took the name Gallio when he was adopted by Iunius Gallio. He is known because of Seneca's dedicating *De Ira* and *De Vita Beata* to him, and because he was proconsul of Achaia when St. Paul visited Athens in 52, see *RE* I 2236, *PIR* II 237 n° 494, Castillo Garcia no. 192, Fr. 87 n. 5.

Of his literary products nothing is known. But he exhorted Columella to write his tenth book in poetry: Col. IX 16, 2 *Publi Silvine, deinceps ita, ut et tibi et Gallioni nostro complacerat*, see Schanz-Hosius 787-8. He was a friend of the poet Lucilius, see Sen. *Nat.* IV *Praef.* 10 ff.

Vassileiou (40-2) and Delarue (RPh. 1974, 274-7) argue that *dulcem* is an imitation of Sen. *Nat.* IV *Praef.* 11 *nemo enim mortalium uni tam dulcis est quam hic omnibus*, where Seneca describes his brother's sweet character. *Therefore*, they argue, *dulcis* here does not refer to poetry and *therefore* Gallio did not write poetry. Whereas it is possible that St. alludes to Gallio's character with *dulcis*, the fact that he is named here makes him, I think, automatically a poet, whether this is connected with *dulcis* or not. *Dulcis* is used in literary criticism, see *OLD* 7c, e.g. Cic. *De Orat.* II 58, Quint. *Inst.* X 1, 73. St. says it of his poetical friends Stella (*dulcis vates* I 2, 33) and Septimius (IV 5, 34). See also *Vita Vaccae* 335, 3 (below 36-41n.).

generasse: For *generare* with a city or region for the subject, see Verg. *A.* V 61. *Troia generatus Acestes*, Ov. *Met.* XV 19, Sil. XIII 364, XIV 197.

For the caesura, see *Intr.* under **II.**

Attollat refluos in astra fontes Graio nobilior Melete Baetis: 'Let the Baetis, flowing back to its source, exalt itself to the stars, for it is more noble than the Greek Meles'. The Baetis is the Guadalquivir, the greatest river of Baetica. The Meles is a small river near Smyrna, where Homer was born. Sometimes the Homeric *Lives* make Homer the son of the river-god Meles or say that he was born near the stream, see *RE* XV[1] 492-4. St. is the only Latin poet who mentions the Meles (also in III 3, 61) and the first writer after Plin. *Nat.* V 118. See also Solin. 40, 15, Mart. Cap. VI 686 (who calls it Mela), Arnob. *Nat.* IV 25.

In hyperbolical zeal St. combines a proverb and an *adynaton* to express Lucan's superiority over Homer: *in astra attollere* stands for the highest fame and happiness; *cf.* I 2, 212-3 *ire polo*, IV 2, 10 *mediis videor discumbere in astris*, Hor. *Carm.* I 1, 36 *feriam sidera* with Nisbet-H., Otto 1890 n° 288. *Pronos relabi posse rivos montibus* (Hor. *Carm.* I 29, 10) is also a proverbial impossibility, see Nisbet-H., Otto no. 678, e.g. Prop. II 15, 33, III 19, 6, Ov. *Ep.* 5, 30, *Tr.* I 8, 1.

With *Graio* St. alludes to Greek poetry.

Baetim Mantua provocare noli: Homer as the zenith of Greek poetry is followed by Vergil, who was born in Mantua. The two are also combined in IV 2, 1-4 and 9, V 3, 62-3, *cf.* II 1, 117. St. varies in *Melete* (river) and *Mantua* (city), like in II 2, 109-11, II 4, 28-9, II 6, 45-7, Mart. I 61 *Verona, Mantua, Aponi tellus, Nilus, Paeligni, Corduba.* Vollmer's explanation that the variation is due to metrical convenience is wrong, for all forms of *Mincius* fit into a hendecasyllable. So is Buchheit's retort (1960, 232 n. 1) that Mantua was better known than the Mincius, for this would also go for Smyrna and Meles.

noli followed by the infinitive occurs only here in St. It is avoided in most serious poetry (once in Lucr., Ov. *Met.*, twice in Prop., 8 times in Mart., not in Vergil, Tib., Hor. *Carm.*, Sen. trag., Luc., VFl., Sil.), see Axelson 135, Cancik *Forschungsbericht* p. 7, and contrast *penes* in 5.

That St. places Lucan here above Homer and Vergil has shocked critics (esp. Barth who prefers even Seneca to Lucan, *iuvenis semidoctus ille*). But St. is writing a poem of praise here and he has to pretend that he thinks Lucan a great poet. Hyperbole is inherent in this kind of poetry, see also V 3, 63 ff. where St. hopes that his father will put him on one line with Homer and Vergil. As Curtius says (171-4), this kind of praise belongs to '*das Wesen höfischer adulatio*', see v.d. Nat n. 11, Vessey 1973, 46 ff., see also 41-80n. and 79-80n. We must accept that St. is not consistent throughout his poems: he recognizes Vergil as his master by far in I 3, 100, IV 2, 9, IV 7, 27-8, *Th.* XII 816 ff., see also II 1, 8-12n., 202-5n., below 93-7n. and 128-31n.

Moreover, there is no reason to doubt that St. admired Lucan (in spite of Delarue RPh 1974, 275-6), see Vessey 1973, 48-9 and for his imitations Michler (98 pages), *Intr.* here under **I.**

For a similar combination of Greek and Latin poetry, see Sid. *Carm.* 9, 217-8 *quod Mantua contumax Homero adiecit latiaribus loquelis.*

36-41.: St. reverts to the past tense (*recepit, exuit*). Here begins the story of Lucan's dedication as a poet: when he was a baby the Muse Calliope fondled him and prophesied his future as a poet. The speech itself plays outside time (but see *Intr.* under **II**); 1-35 and 107-35 represent the present, 36-41 and 105-6 directly frame the speech and are in the past. A new pericope should begin here, as most edd. print (*cf.* Buchheit 1960, 234), but not Vollm., Kl. and Fr.

The motif of the poet who receives a dedication (see 41 *dicate Musis*) is ancient and occurs frequently in Latin literature: Pindar was fed by bees (Paus. IX, 23, 2), on the lips of Stesichorus a nightingale sang (Plin. *Nat.* X 82), Horace was decked with fresh leaves by doves (*Carm.* III 4, 8 ff.)

and Sts.' father was welcomed into life by Apollo and the Muses, see Kroll 1924, 31-2, Kambylis *passim*, for ethnographic parallels Ritoók. The story of Pindar is also told of Lucan: *Vita Vaccae* 335, 3 *cunas infantis...apes circumvolarunt osque insidere complures aut dulcem tum iam spiritum eius haurientes*. The *topos* is not found elsewhere in consolation-literature, see E.-F. 131 § 12.

Calliope's taking Lucan into her lap is the reverse of the actions of Invidia, Nemesis or the Parcae, who cast an evil spell over a new-born child, see II 1, 120-4n., II 6, 72-5n. St. employs the idea of the loving parent or protective divinity who caresses a baby also at I 2, 110 and 260, IV 8, 13-4 *benigno...sinu*, V 5, 79 ff. *blandoque sinu*, see also II 1, 78-81n. St. chooses Calliope here because she is the leader of the Muses and the mother of an archetypal poet herself (below). Her action is announced by mention of the Muses in 8 and 20.

Natum protinus: II 1, 78-81n.

atque: M, *aqu(a)e*: L.

humum per ipsam primo murmure dulce vagientem: Even when the child crawled on the ground it was already sweetly whimpering with its first unarticulated cries. Everything points to Lucan's precociousness, see also 54, 73-4. For *ipsam* (M), L has *ipsum*.

For *murmure* see II 1, 104-5n. and *vagitum* in 106 there, IV 8, 35 *cum...vagiret tertius infans*. For *dulce*: II 1, 60-1n.

blando...sinu: See above, and also *Ach.* I 767-8 *blando...sinu*.

For the whole, see I 2, 260-2 *at te nascentem gremio mea prima recepit/Parthenope dulcisque solo tu gloria nostro/reptasti*, Sid. *Carm.* 23, 204-7 *iam primo tenero calentem ab ortu/excepere sinu novem sorores/et te de genetrice vagientem/tinxerunt vitrei vado Hippocrenes*.

Calliope: She is the most important Muse already in Greek poetry, e.g. Hes. *Theog.* 79-80. In Latin e.g. V 3, 14-5, Ov. *Met.* V 662, *Fast.* V 80. She is often considered as the Muse of epic poetry: III 1, 50, *Th.* IV 35, VIII 374, *AP* IX 504, 1 Καλλιόπη σοφίην ἡρωΐδος εὗρεν ἀοιδῆς, Verg. *A.* IX 525 ff., Sil. III 22, XII 390, Nemes. *Cyn.* 11-2, Aus. *Carm.* 20, 9. This is why she protects Lucan here, *cf.* *Anth.Lat.* 565, 4 (on Vergil) *rustica mox, eadem Martia Calliope.* See Todd 44-51 (also for many instances of Calliope as a Muse for all kinds of non-epic poetry).

In Latin poetry, as in Greek, she is the mother of Orpheus (40): V 1, 23, V 3, 15, Verg. *Ecl.* 4, 53, Ov. *Met.* X 147, 482, VFl. IV 349, Mart. IX 86, 6, Sid. *Carm.* 6, 29, Claud. *Carm.* 31, 20, see *RE* XVII 2082 ff. and XVIII[1] 1219.

posito remissa luctu...Orpheos exuit dolores: *Posito luctu*, laying aside her mourning (II 1, 48-9n.), implies the same thing as *remissa*, relaxing, placid (Sen. *Phoen.* 187, Tac. *Dial.* 11, 1, Mart. IV 14, 11, *al.*)

and *exuit dolores*, she laid aside her grief. For *exuere* with an abstract object, see I 4, 7-8 *damnosa ...fila senectae exuit*, Mulder on *Th.* II 396 *fortunam exuere.*

Orpheos: St. always uses the Greek forms *Orphea* (V 3, 16, *Th.* V 435, generally in Latin poetry) and *Orpheos* (also in 99). This gen. is originally Homeric (e.g. Τύδεος υἱός). It is found a few times in Attic tragedy, *cf.* Kühner-Blass I 449.

In Latin the Greek forms on *-eus* have their regular gen. in *-eos*. *Orpheos* occurs also at *Culex* 269, *Ib.* 602, Aus. *Gryphus tern. num.* 74, *Itin. Alex.* 7. St. makes a very extensive use of these genitives in *-eos* compared to other Latin poets: *Theseos* IV 4, 104, *Th.* IX 519, XII 293, Ov. *Met.* VIII 268. *Perseos*: *Th.* I 225, VII 418, Luc. IX 676, *al.* *Peleos*: *Ach.* I 507, Mart. II 64, 3. *Tereos*: III 3, 176, Mart. IV 49, 4. *Phoroneos*: *Th.* I 252. *Oeneos*: *Th.* I 464, II 588, 687. *Nereos*: *Th.* III 410, V 437, *Ach.* I 452, Petr. 139, 2, vs. 7, *Anth.Lat.* 21, 49. *Tydeos*: fourteen times in the Thebaid. *Caeneos*: *Th.* VII 644. *Caphareos*: *Th.* IX 307. *Prometheos*: *Th.* XI 468. *Menoeceos*: XI 709. *Cf.* *Eteocleos*: *Th.* XII 91, 421. See Neue-Wagener I 455-6.

et dixit: Sts.' main reason for letting Calliope deliver a speech is compositional: he wants to break the monotony of a long poem by a speech as its longest and most important part, see also Cairns 1972, *Ch.* 8 on speaker-variation. The custom of the birthday-speech, for which Menander gives rules (III 412, 23 ff. *Sp.*) may have existed also in Sts.' time.

The speech is a prophecy about Lucan's career, or rather a *vaticinium ex eventu*. St. employs a traditional *topos*, for the prophesizing speech is a frequent element in Latin poetry. It occurs in epic, e.g. Luc. I 678 ff., VI 777 ff., Moore 1921, Schremp, esp. 91-107. It is also at home in the smaller *genres*: Catul. 64, Hor. *Carm.* III 5, 2-4, Tib. II 5, 39 ff., III 4, 43 ff., Prop. II 10, 13 ff. For St., see IV 1, 37 ff., *Th.* I 80 ff., II 32 ff., III 71 ff., IV 397 ff., VI 513 ff., 911 ff. See *RE* XXIII 797-816 (*Prophetes*) and esp. Buchheit 1960, 242 ff.

But St. innovates in one respect: at a birthday or a similar feast it is the Parcae who prophecy, not the Muses: Catul. 64, 305 ff., 323-81, Tib. I 7, 1 ff., *cf.* [Tib.] III 4, 45-6 *proles Semelae Bacchus doctaeque sorores/dicere non norunt, quid ferat hora sequens.* That Calliope speaks here emphasizes Lucan's role as a poet.

The speech consists mainly of praise of Lucan. St. is the first Roman poet to induce gods or mythical figures for the purpose of an *encomium*: the speaking god is at home in epic poetry, but it also occurs in elegies and twice in Horace's Odes (*Carm.* I 15, III 3, 18 ff.). No other poet, however, puts the praises of the addressee in a god's mouth. This is a Hellenistic technique. St. uses it in I 1, 74-83, I 2, 162-93, I 4, 61-105,

III 1, 91-116, IV 1, 17-43, IV 3, 72-94 and 124-61. All these speeches occur about halfway the poem or later and are rather long (from about 9% to about 55%). Speeches in St., as in Hor., usually begin when the poem is already well under way. But unlike speeches in Horace they never end the poem, see Fraenkel 1957, 66 and 428 n. 1. This is one of the ways in which St. inextricably fuses the world of the real and realistic with that of mythology. See II 1, 88-102n., II 3 *Intr.*, Szelest 1972, esp. 315 ff. For speeches, see II 3, 24-6n. and *Appendix.*

dixit contrasts with *sic fata est* in 105. Similarly *exuit dolores* becomes *decidentes abrasit lacrimas* in 105-6, see also below.

41-104.: The speech of Calliope. It consists of three parts: **1)** Lucan's works (41-80), **2)** his marriage (81-8), **3)** the lament for Lucan (89-104).

St. demonstrates here his technique of touching upon a subject and gradually expanding it, see II 1 *Intr.* (under **I.**) about Sts.' habit of introducing topics in the beginning of his *consolationes*, Newmyer 79, Buchheit 1960, 240 with n. 5. He does this with the Muses and Calliope, see 36-41n. above, and with the theme of Lucan as a Roman poet, see 21-3n. and 48-53n. The technique is esp. clear in the case of Polla, who commissioned the poem: she is first mentioned as the subject of one of Lucan's works in 62-3, as 'the chaste Polla'. St. returns to her virtues in 81-8 where she is praised as an ideal wife. The final section of the poem, 121-31, elaborates on her fidelity to Lucan, almost as an *unio mystica.* See also II 2, where the final part of the poem gathers strands from its foregoing parts (II 2 *Intr.* under **II.**). This gradual expansion is also seen in the theme of grief: it is touched upon in *heu nimis* (24), alluded to in 39-40, and after the climax of happiness, the marriage, returns in 89 ff. up to 104.

41-80.: Lucan and Literature. The most important part of Calliope's speech. It is a good example of 'recessed panel structuring', a thematic ordering according to ABCBA, see Newmyer 54 ff., 77 ff. Newmyer (77) discerns 5 parts: **1)** 'Lucan will excel other poets and their subjects' (41-4), **2)** *Bellum Civile* (45-53), **3)** early works (54-63), **4)** *Bellum Civile* (64-72), **5)** 'Lucan will excel other poets and their subjects' (73-80). The structure is almost symmetrical (4 lines, 9, 10, 9, 8).

On the other hand, this view of the structure of 41-80 suggests that the central part, Lucan's minor works, are the most important ones to St. We should combine this view with the idea of Sts.' expanding a subject: the *Bellum Civile* is touched upon in 52-3 (and not really relevant for 48-51) and forms the climax of this section by its comparison to the Aeneid (79-80). In 73-80 St. develops by specific examples the theme of

the beginning of the speech, *cf.* Newmyer 79. The implication of *primum...ludes* (54-5)...*mox* (64) and the comparison of Lucan's age with that of Vergil when he wrote his *Culex*, a *lusus*, is that Lucan surpasses Vergil both by his precociousness and by the literary value of his epic poem.

This points to another structural principle which St. employs, that of the comparison between authors. It is the same principle which plays a great part in Quint. *Inst.* X, where Quintilian is 'making canons of classical Latin authors to correspond as closely as possible with the Greek canons' (Nettleship in Peterson's commentary on *Inst.* X 1, 85). See also Prop. II 34, 55-6 *cedite Romani scriptores, cedite Grai! Nescio quid maius nascitur Iliade, Laus Pis.* 230-2, Sil. VIII 593-4 (both about Vergil/Homer), v.d. Nat n. 11, 34-5n. and 79-80n. here. The (often hyperbolical) statement by (a favourable) comparison is a favourite device of St., see II 1, 8-12n. Here he handles the comparison of Lucan to other authors in a way that reminds of the 'priamel' (a word coined by German scholars for this kind of comparison, see Nisbet-H. *Intr.* to Hor. *Carm.* I 1) *laudabunt alii* and therefore of the *recusatio* (see 48-53n.): Lucan surpasses mythical (Greek) poets (42-53) and historical (Roman) poets (73-80).

The comparison is important also on another level: Lucan is a kind of *alter Orpheus* for Calliope: as soon as she sees him, she puts aside her mourning (40) and prophecies that he will be a greater poet than Orpheus (43-7). Her grief for Orpheus is replaced by her grief for Lucan (98 ff.). Orpheus is the subject of one of Lucan's minor poems (59).

41-2. puer o: The dislocation of *o* is frequent in poetry, *cf.* Pease on Verg. *A.* IV 578 *adsis o*, with more than 80 examples. In the *Silv.* it occurs at I 2, 169 *satis o*, ten times in the Thebaid. It is esp. frequent in commands and appeals.

longaevos...transiture vates: *Longaevus*, old, forms a contrast with *puer.* But here it mainly implies 'poets of old', *praevalente respectu antiquitatis* (*TLL* VII^2 1619, 44 ff.). This meaning is rare, and *TLL* quotes only two (not very apt) parallels: Mart. *Sp.* 5, 3 *longaeva vetustas* and *Epist. Pontif. Arel.* 29 p. 42, 17 *a longaevis saeculis.*

For *transire*, to surpass, a metaphor from racing, *cf.* e.g. Luc. II 565, IV 497, Quint. *Inst.* X 2, 10, XII 11, 28. For the future part., see II 1, 52-4n.

43-7. non...sed: Lucan is favourably compared to Orpheus: he will not move Thracian nature, but Roman nature and Roman dignitaries.

non...flumina...greges ferarum...Geticas movebis ornos: Orpheus charming trees and beasts with his music is a *topos* since Eur. *Bacch.* 560.

The rivers are added to this since Ap.Rhod. *Arg.* I 26-7 and are also frequently mentioned in Latin poetry, e.g. V 1, 24, Hor. *Carm.* I 12, 29 (with Nisbet-H.), Prop. III 2, 1-2, see *RE* XVIII[1] 1248-50 with a complete survey, also II 2, 60-2n. Orpheus moving rocks is also often mentioned. St. leaves it out here to state it hyperbolically of Lucan (*iuga* 45).

For *Geticas*, see II 2, 60-2n. Here it implies also 'barbarian', a contrast with the references to Rome in 45-7.

septem iuga Martiumque Thybrim: For *septem iuga*, the hills of Rome, see II 3, 20-2n. On the form *Thybrim*, see II 6, 64-5n.

Martius, belonging to Mars, means Roman, because Mars is the father of Romulus and Remus (*cf.* I 2, 193 *Martia...Ilia*), see Ov. *Met.* XIV 798, Mart. I 3, 4 *Martia turba.*

doctos equites et eloquente cantu purpureum trahes senatum: Still more than Orpheus, Luc. will attract dead and living things with his music, see II 2, 119-20 *doctam...trahuntur ad chelyn...delphines*, 60-2n.

St. mentions two different qualities of knights and senators: the first are *docti*, interested in poetry (3, II 2, 118-20n.), the senate is the most august body: *purpureus* because of the purple border of the senatorial *toga*, see I 2, 179-80, IV 1, 26 *purpurei patres.* For *purpureus*, see also Mart. XII 29, 5 *purpureis...fastis*, the list of consuls. Markl. disliked the variation and conjectured *celsos* for *doctos*, presumably because of Hor. *Ars* 342 *celsi...Ramnes.*

eloquente cantu: in one expression St. alludes to Lucan's prose and his poetry, or his prosaic and poetical side, *cf.* Quintilian's famous judgment (*Inst.* X 1, 90) *Lucanus ardens concitatus et sententiis clarissimus et...magis oratoribus quam poetis imitandus.* In *cantu* St. also alludes to the magic quality of Lucan's (and Orpheus') poetry, see II 1, 3-7n.

48-53. alii...tu: St. employs the form of the priamel here, an enumeration of other people's preferences to contrast them with someone's own attitude, see Nisbet-H. *Intr.* to Hor. *Carm.* I 1. This device is often used in the so-called *recusatio*, the poet refuses to write a certain kind of poem pretending that others can do so better, e.g. Pind. *Nem.* 8, 37 ἑτέροι...ἐγὼ δέ, *Anacreontea* 11, Tib. I 1, 1 ff., *cf.* Fr. 88 n. 1. But the priamel is also used in *encomium* (Hor. *Carm.* I 7, 1 *laudabunt alii* with Nisbet-H.) and elsewhere, see Norden on *A.* VI 847, Fraenkel 1957, 230 ff.

The theme which St. strikes here is 'all kinds of subjects are trite, you will find new paths'. This *topos* occurs also at Verg. *G.* III 3 ff. *cetera...omnia iam vulgata*, Man. II 1 ff. *omnis ad accessus Heliconos semita trita est*, III 5 ff., *Aetna* 17 ff., Juv. 1, 1 ff., Mart. X 4, Nemes. *Cyneg.* 15 ff. The extremes are reached by Sid. *Carm.* 9, 16 ff., who takes about 300 lines to tell of what he will not sing, see 16-8 *non nos currimus aggerem*

vetustum/nec quicquam invenies ubi priorum/antiquas terat orbitas Thalia. The theme is a kind of *praeteritio.* See also *Silv.* V 3, 80 ff. *nota nimis vati* (85), Vollm. here and Legras 1905, 8.

St. mentions three worn themes: the fall of Troy, the wanderings of Odysseus and the journey of the Argonauts. He wisely omits themes from the Theban cycle or the life of Achilles, the subjects of his own poetry. Vollm. remarks that St. may refer to earlier plans of Lucan to treat the three themes dismissed here. This is possible, but can not be (dis-)proved.

Here St. does not aim at specific poets, see Vollm., Fr. 88 n. 1, Delarue (Latomus 1974) 537-8; differently Mozl., Vessey CW 1970, 51-2. The themes are so general that St. can hardly refer to a specific poem or poet; he announces here the subject of 75 ff., Lucan's superiority to other, named poets, see 41-104n. and 41-80n.

Nocturnas...Phrygum ruinas: For *Phryx*, Trojan, see II 1, 144-5n. Troy fell at night, *cf.* Eur. *Hec.* 914 μεσονύκτιος ὠλλύμαν, Verg. *A.* II 250 ff. (*nox*).

tardi reducis vias Ulixis: Early commentators (Barth, Markl. and others) favoured Barth's *tarde reducis vias Ulixis*, see II 1, 118 *tarde remeantis Ulixis*, IV 2, 4 *reducem Ulixem. Redux*, 'leading back', 'by which one returns', is rare (not in Verg., Ov., Luc., VFl., Sil. The word does not occur in Hor. and Prop.). But *cf.* Luc. IX 408 *irreducem viam...carpit.* The word is more often used for gods who lead or bring back home: *OLD* 1, e.g. Ov. *Ep.* 13, 50 *reduci...Iovi*, Mart. VIII 65, 1 *Fortunae Reducis.* For *tardus Ulixes*, see II 6, 57, V 3, 148. *Reducis vias Ulixes* stands on one line with *nocturnas Phrygum ruinas* (see also *supplex aurum* 56). So the reading can be kept.

puppem temerariam Minervae: 'the daring ship of Minerva' is the Argo. For Minerva's aid in its construction, *cf.* Ap.Rhod. *Arg.* I 18-9, VFl. I 93-4, V 504 *ratem...Minervae, RE* II 721-2.

For its audacity, *cf.* Sen. *Med.* 607 *audacis...carinae*, Luc. III 193-4 *Argo...temerato litore.* St. alludes to the well-known *topos* of the 'blame of seafaring', see II 6, 25-8n., Nisbet-H. on Hor. *Carm.* I 3, 12, Heydenreich 2, 23-5, 41, 46-7, and for its survival up to Thomas Mann: 64 ff., 111 ff., 197 ff., 249 ff. In St. it occurs at III 2, 61 ff. (Vollm. there), *Th.* VI 19, *Ach.* I 64-5.

trita vatibus orbita: For the metaphor of poetry as a path, see above on *alii...tu*, Lucr. I 921 *avia Pieridum peragro*, Verg. *G.* III 291-3 *ire...qua nulla devertitur orbita*, Hor. *Ars* 132 *vilem...patulumque orbem* ('comparable for the wording but not for the content': Brink), Prop. III 1, 3 ff., IV 6, 10, Man. II 50, 138. It comes out of Call. *Aitia frg.* 1, 27-8 κελεύθους ἀτρίπτους, see Kambylis 257, Wimmel 103-11, Brouwers 133-4.

carus Latio memorque gentis: 'Beloved by Latium and mindful of its race'. Lucan is *carus Latio* because he is *memor gentis*. For *carus*, see *dulcibus* 58, Hor. *Ep.* I 20, 10 *carus eris Romae*. *Latio* contrasts with the Greek subjects mentioned above.

carmen fortior exeres togatum: 'You will unsheathe a Roman poem'. The *Bellum Civile* with its historical subject and absence of mythology was quickly recognized as a typically Roman poem: Petr. 119, 1 has *Romanus* as the first line, *cf.* Luc. I 66 *Romana...carmina* (for the allusions to Lucan's own poem in II 7, see 64-9n. *Pharsalica bella, fulmen*, 70-2n., 93-7n., 113n.), Mart. VII 23, 1-2 *Phoebe veni, sed quantus eras cum bella tonanti/ipse dares Latiae plectra secunda lyrae*, see 21-3n., 41-104n., Häussler 46.

For *togatus* as 'Roman', see I 4, 11, I 6, 36 *orbem...et gentes...togatas*, V 3, 108-9, (*fabula*) *togata* in Hor. *Ars* 288, Quint. *Inst.* X 1, 100, *al.*, see II 1, 113-9n.

Fortior and *exeres* allude to the military subject of the poem. For *fortior*, see Hor. *S.* I 10, 43 *forte epos, Ep.* II 1, 50 *Ennius...fortis* (with Kiessling-Heinze), *Th.* I 32-3 *tua fortior...facta canam* (with Heuvel). *Exerere* means 'to utter' in a few cases: Sen. *Her.O.* 255, Quint. *Decl.* XIII 6, p. 217, 7, see *TLL* V² 1858, 50 ff. This is the only place where *TLL* (*loc. cit.* 77) explains it as '*fere i.q. componere*'. I think that Vollm. is right in explaining '*dass Lucan...etwas Neues, Unerhörtes, wie eine Waffe* (see *OLD* 2b) *hervorzustrecken wagt*', see also below on 57 for Sts.' blending poem and content.

Exeres is Markland's correction of *exeris* (LM). Two future tenses precede it and 10 follow it. The corruption is very slight (see Fr. 1943, XXXI). Vollmer keeps *exeris*, claiming that it '*sequantur* einfach die Hauptsache entgegen setzt' (applauded by Mar. *ed.* p. 147). This would also apply to 47 *trahes* and 66 *detonabis*. I follow Markl., with Baehr., Kl., Saeng., Fr., Sb., Traglia (-Ar.), see also van Dam 403.

54-72.: This catalogue of Lucan's writings is, together with the *vita Lucani* ascribed to Vacca (for editions, see Schanz-Hosius 493), our main source for Lucan's literary production. Vacca and St. differ in the number and names of the works, and this section of II 7 has given rise to more scholarly discussions than most other parts of the *Silvae*.

The catalogue is roughly chronological, as far as we can judge. In any case, the order is not different from Vacca's, and *primum, hinc, mox* (54, 62, 64) seem to stress the chronology. Though Lucan was already working on the *Bellum Civile* at the time of the *De Incendio Urbis* and the *Adlocutio ad Pollam* (below), it was unfinished when he died, and rightly comes in the last place (*cf.* Mensching 252, Ahl 1971, 8-9, 26-7 and below), also because it is Lucan's greatest claim to renown. This last fact

may serve as a warning not to take the order here as too strict proof for the chronology of Lucan's work: the *Adlocutio ad Pollam* forms the centre of the enumeration, or the last climax of the series before the *Bellum Civile.* This rather implies that it is important to *Silv.* II 7 (because Polla ordered the poem and therefore plays a role in its structure, see 41-80n.) than that it gives exact information as to the date of its composition.

54-5. primum...Hectora Thessalosque currus et...Priami...aurum: *Vita Vaccae* 330 (Hosius): *extant eius complures et alii* (*libri*), *ut Iliacon, Saturnalia, Catachthonion, Silvarum X, tragoedia Medea imperfecta, Salticae fabulae XIV et Epigrammata*[12].

The only works of these *libri* which St. mentions are the *Iliacon*, here, and the *Catachthonion* in 57. If we take St. at his word (as Schanz-Hosius 495 do) the *Iliacon* treated mainly of Hector, his death and the ransom of his body. But *Iliacon liber/libri* suggests a wider range, and St. has a tendency to pick out details, *cf.* II 1, 36-105n., 92-3n., 178-82n., II 6, 25-8n., 30-3n. But it seems improbable that the fall of Troy occurred in the work, in view of 48. In view of *ludes* (below) and *detonabis* (66), the *Iliacon* was probably something other than epic or tragedy, also because the tragedy *Medea* is mentioned separately by Vacca, and because it would be surprising if Lucan had written two epics without any ancient critic mentioning this. We may think of short scenes or poems on scenes of the Iliad, a collection of libretti for mimes, or anything of the kind.

Two fragments of the *Iliacon* occur in Hosius' edition of Lucan. They throw no light on its subject or Sts.' lines.

Thessalos...currus: is the chariot of Achilles. For *Thessalos*, see II 1, 88-9., *Ach.* I 651-2.

ludes Hectora: *ludere* and *ludus* are employed for all kinds of poetry, in all metres, except for epic and tragedy. Notions connected with the words are that of unimportant content, exercise and juvenile poetry, *otium*, see Brouwers 71 ff., Wimmel 295-6. Sts.' favourite idea with *ludere* and *proludere* is that the works in question (also art) are mere exercises for the real work, see I *Praef.* 10 *praeluserit*, IV *Praef.* 31-2 *lusio*, II 2, 64-7n., Aricò 45-6, Aus. *Ep.* 25 *Praef. paucis iambis praeludendum...dum illud, quod...heroico metro desideras incohatur.* But Lucan's *lusus* may have been in hexameters, like Sts.' or Vergil's. The word must not always be taken to imply that the author really thinks of his work as *nugae*: Sts.' *consolationes* are also *praelusiones*, see II *Praef.* 8-13n. St. implies that even Lucan's juvenile poetry occupied itself with important themes and thereby praises his precocity.

---

[12] *et apammata*: mss., *epigrammata*: Reifferscheid.

For *Hectora* see II *Praef.* 5 (*liber*) *habet Glauciam nostrum*, 58 and 59 below: *Nero, Orpheus.* See II *Praef.* 5-8n.

Ludes: L, Q[1], *laudes*: M[1], *laudas*: m.

ac primum: I 1, 71, II 6, 74, III 4, 28. Therefore Klotz' *at primum* (in his ed.) is unnecessary.

teneris in annis: *Cf.* II 3, 35-7n. Before Lucan was 21, if the chronology is to be trusted, see 58-9n.

57. sedes reserabis inferorum: The *Catachthonion.* For a fragment of it, see Hosius' ed. of Luc. 330. No conclusion as to its character is possible.

reserabis: 'you will open up the Underworld'. St. makes a frequent use of this device: what a poet describes is considered as his action, see II 1, 113-9n., Vollm. on 52 here and V 3, 99, here in 58-9, 71-2, 77-8, I 2, 105 *deflevit fata columbae* (*Stella*), III 2, 142 *devictis dederim...busta Pelasgis*, IV 2, 2-4 *qui magnum Aenean Laurentibus intulit arvis...aequore qui multo reducem consumpsit Ulixem, Ach.* I 4-7 *nos...heroa velis* (you, Muse) *Scyro... latentem Dulichia proferre tuba nec in Hectore tracto sistere, sed tota iuvenem deducere Troia* (and perhaps *Silv.* V 3, 92).

The earliest (and the only Greek) example that I know is [Mosch.] *Epit. Bion.* 82 (the poet) καὶ σύριγγας ἔτευχε, καὶ ἁδέα πόρτιν ἄμελγε. In Latin also: Hor. *S.* I 10, 36 *turgidus Alpinus iugulat dum Mennona*, II 5, 41 *Furius hibernas cana nive conspuet Alpes*, Verg. *Ecl.* 6, 46 (*Silenus*) *Pasiphaen nivei solatur amore iuvenci*, Prop. III 3, 41-2 (Calliope says to Propertius) *nil tibi sit rauco praeconia classica cornu/ flare, nec Aonium tingere Marte nemus, Aetna* 80-1 *hi* (*vates*) *Tityon poena stravere in iugera foedum; /sollicitant illi te circum, Tantale, poena*[13].

This device and similar ones to fuse poem and subject become more developed in Neolatin Renaissance poetry, see e.g. Janus Secundus *Eleg.* III 16, 15 ff. *quam iuvat antiquos pariter cantare poetas...cumque pio Aenea Laurentem quaerere Tibrim, securus Turno quam paret ille necem. Aut legere infestas qui Caesaris intonat iras...Dein vatis varias per Silvas Parthenopaei ire Amphioniae moenia in alta lyrae; et fera Thebanos armare in proelia fratres, El.* I 1-4 *Pierides alius dira inter bella cruentet, vulneraque ingeminet saeva necesque virum*[14].

et: Markl. and Cornelissen (287) conjectured *tu*, written by Clouard, but this is unnecessary, see van Dam 403.

58-9. ingratus Nero dulcibus theatris et noster tibi proferetur Orpheus: Vacca 335, 21 (H.) *certamine penteterico acto in Pompeii theatro, laudibus recitatis in Neronem, fuerat coronatus et ex tempore Orphea scriptum in experimentum adversus complures ediderat poetas, et tres libros, quales videmus.*

[13] The text is corrupt, but the same device seems to be employed here.

[14] These parallels (and other cognate examples) I owe to the erudition of Dr. J. P. Guépin of Leyden.

This shows that the *laudibus Neronis*, the *Orpheus* and the *Catachthonion* (54-6n.) are three separate works, and that those who identify the *Orpheus* with the *Catachthonion* are wrong (Markland, Cornelissen 287). It seems natural to identify *Nero* here with the *laudibus in Neronem* of Vacca[15]. This is the only datable work in the catalogue. It was written in 60, when Lucan was 20 years of age, see Schanz-Hosius 495, Ahl 1971, 26-7. The proximity of the *Orpheus* to it in Vacca and here suggests that it dates from about the same time. See also K. F. C. Rose 379 ff., Ahl 1976, 333 ff.

ingratus Nero: 'hateful Nero', from Calliope's point of view, because he murdered her 'second son' Lucan, see 100 *rabidi nefas tyranni. Ingratus* could also mean 'ungrateful' (for Lucan's praise, because Nero murdered him); but 'hateful' seems more in accord with the rest of Calliope's negative judgment, see 61 *nocentis*, van Dam 404.

dulcibus theatris depends on *proferetur*, not on *ingratus*: Lucan offers Nero to the spectators of the theatre, who like his work, award him a prize, and therefore are *dulces*, see 46-7, van Dam *loc. cit.*

proferetur is a vague word, which can mean 'put on show (in the theatre)': *OLD* 2a, e.g. Phaed. V 5, 10 *genus spectaculi quod in theatro nunquam prolatum foret*, Suet. *Nero* 25, 1 (*Nero*) *artem protulerat.* It can also be used in a more vague sense: 'to bring before the public' (*OLD* 6). The nature of the *Orpheus* can not be inferred from it: Suet. above refers to singing; here a mime may be meant (*cf.* Mart. *Sp.* 21 where a mime-actor playing *Orpheus* is lacerated by a bear, Suet. *Nero* 12, 2 and 21, 3), but it may also be a dramatic monologue, one of Vacca's *salticae fabulae* (54-6n.), or something completely different. Serv. on Verg. *G.* IV 492 refers to *Lucanus in Orpheo*, see Norden on *A.* VI p. 237. Hosius' ed. of Luc. 328 has 8 fragments. So it was published, though it was a slight extempore work, see Vollm., Ahl 1971, 26-7.

The phrase as a whole means: 'You will offer to the favouring theatres hateful Nero and my son Orpheus'.

60-1. Dices culminibus Remi vagantis...ignes: Vacca 330 (H) *epigrammata, prosa orationes in Octavium Sagittam et pro eo, de incendio Urbis, epistularum ex Campania.* That 60-1 refer to *De incendio Urbis* is clear, but whether this was a poem or written in prose is a fiercely debated question. *Poetry*: Gagliardi 435-8, Ahl 1971, 1-7 and 1976 *Appendix. Prose*: Vollm., Fr., Schanz-Hosius 495, McGann *CQ* 1957, 4, 391, McGann

[15] Bardon 1939, 235-8 identifies *Nero* with the *Octavia praetexta*, which he ascribes to Lucan. But the words *ingratus Nero* would be a strange description of that work and there is no proof at all for the ascription to Lucan, the more so since the *Octavia* must date from after Nero's death.

1971, 63-5 (against Gagliardi), McGann 1975, 213-7 (against Ahl), Traglia-Ar. Plessis 552 proposed a mixture of poetry and prose.

In favour of poetry are: **1)** *haec canes* 73, *solum carminum nitorem* (81) and more generally that Calliope is a muse of poetry and would not be interested in prose. **2)** If *De incendio Urbis* is in prose than the *Epistulae ex Campania* are also in prose, if it is in poetry than both are in poetry, for this results from Vacca. The title of the *Epistulae* seems an imitation of Ovid's *Epistulae ex Ponto* rather than of Seneca's *ad Lucilium.* Therefore both works were poems. **3)** The fire was a very good subject for a poem (Gagliardi 437, to which one might add a reference to *Silv.* V 3, 195-208).

In favour of prose are: **1)** *Dices* (60) refers to prose and 21 *geminas...artes* leads us to expect at least one work in prose. **2)** The testimony of Vacca (see below).

dices and *canes* contradict each other. But *haec canes* refers only to the *Bellum Civile* (73-4n.). And it would be rather perverse to take *dices* here as referring to poetry (but not impossible, see *TLL* V[1] 977, 65 ff., 982, 21 ff.).

McGann (1975) argues that in Vacca (*orationes*) *in* and *pro* would make it clear enough that these were prose orations. So the addition of *prosa* shows that this goes also for the rest.

This seems convincing, and there is another argument: Sagitta was tried in 58. The *orationes* were probably *suasoriae*, referring to relatively current events, *cf.* Ahl 1971, 26-7. So these were also early works, dating perhaps from 60/61. It would be strange that Vacca mentions them at the end of his catalogue, unless they start a new subdivision, prose.

De Incendio Urbis is mentioned by St. as an other proof of Nero's cruelty and in that respect it continues 58 and announces 100 ff. Ahl (1971, 6 ff.) makes a convincing case for the hypothesis that this work was Nero's reason to put a ban on Lucan: Vacca: *interdictum est ei poetica, interdictum est etiam causarum actionibus*, see Tac. *Ann.* XV 49, Dio LXII 29, 4, Suet. *Vita Luc.* 332, 10 ff.

Vollm. suggests that Lucan inspired Sts.' father for his poem on the fire of the Capitol in 69, see V 3, 199 ff.

culminibus Remi, the hills of Rome, *cf.* I 1, 64 *septem...culmina*, I 5, 23, Sil. III 510 *Iovis...culmen*, the Capitol, II 3, 20-2n. *Culminibus*: HIKQ[2], *fulminibus*: LM.

Remi for *Romuli*, as in V 2, 18, Catul. 58, 5, Prop. II 1, 23, IV 6, 80, Juv. 10, 73, *cf.* Schubert 49.

infandos domini nocentis ignes: For *domini ignes*, see *TLL* VII 291, 63 ff. '*indicatur auctor ignis*', e.g. Caes. *Gal.* II 9, 1 and 3 *hostium ignis.* An adj. is more usual, e.g. Verg. *A.* II 276 *Phrygios ignis*, X 56, Hor. *Carm.* I 15, 36, *al.*

St. implies the conviction that Nero had set fire to the city, in August 64, but not necessarily Lucan's conviction[16]. He wants to stress Nero's cruelty, see *nocentum* 117, *domini* 'tyrant'.

62-3. Hinc: σ, *huc*: LM, 'then'. This work is singled out between Lucan's juvenilia because of Polla.

castae titulum decusque Pollae iucunda dabis adlocutione: This work, generally called *Adlocutio ad Pollam*, is not mentioned elsewhere. It may well be one of Lucan's *Silvae* (see Vacca at 54-6), as Vollm. suggests, followed by Newmyer (34). In that case it may be imitated by St. in *Silv.* III 5, which is called *egloga ad uxorem* in σ, *cf.* II *Praef.* 22 *egloga, qua...Claudiam meam exhortor.* In the sense of a 'poem of exhortation' *adlocutio* is also used by Porphyrio at Hor. *Ep.* I 20. Vulg. *Sap.* 3: 18 translates παραμύθιον with it, *cf.* Fr. 88 n. 8.

On the other hand, *adlocutio* is used for 'consolation': Var. *L.* 157 *adlocutum mulieres ire aiunt, cum eunt ad aliquem locum consolandi causa*, Catul. 38, 5 *qua solatus es adlocutione* and 7, Sen. *Dial.* VI 1, 6, *cf.* Liv. IX 6, 8 *alloquia*, Hor. *Epod.* 13, 18, Tac. *Ann.* IV 8, 3 *alloquia propinquorum.* Vulg. *Sap.* 8: 9 translates παραίνεσις φροντίδων καὶ λύπης with it.

Iucundus, however, hardly seems the word to qualify a poetical *consolatio*, and one would expect St. to be clearer if he wanted to say that Lucan had consoled his wife. *Iucunda* is probably meant as a term of literary criticism: Ov. *Tr.* II 369 *iucundi Menandri*, Quint. *Inst.* X 1, 46 (*Homerus*) *laetus ac pressus, iucundus et gravis*, see Peterson there and *OLD* 1b.

So its subject cannot be reconstructed.

St. begins his praise of Polla here, see 41-104n. *Castae* does not exclude a former marriage (*Intr.* under **IV.**), *cf.* V 1, 45-6 *illa quidem nuptum...prior...passa...sed te ceu virginitate iugatum*, 55 *unum novisse cubile* and Fr. 176 n. 1.

For *titulum decusque*, see II 2, 143-6n.

64-9. Mox: After *primum* and *hinc* introduces the *Bellum Civile.* St. treats it in about as many lines as the minor works, without an apparent scheme.

coepta...iuventa: Lucan probably started work on the *Bellum Civile* in the beginning of 64, before the breach with Nero, or possibly somewhat earlier, *cf.* Schanz-Hosius 495-6 and Ahl 1971, 26-7. Then he was about 24; *iuventa* began at 20 years of age. Contrast *teneris in annis* 54; *coepta* stresses Lucan's precocity, see 37, 74.

---

[16] For Nero's role, see J. Beaujeu, *L'incendie de Rome en 64 et les chrétiens* (Bruxelles 1960), Ahl 1971, 6 n. 11.

generosior: 'Of more noble spirit', because of the epic's lofty tone and subject compared with Lucan's other works.

albos ossibus Italis Philippos et Pharsalica bella detonabis: *Detonare* means 'to say with a voice like thunder': Sil. XVII 201 *haec ubi detonuit* (Hannibal), *cf.* IV 9, 14-5 *dicta...quae...iuvenis Foro tonabas*, Prop. IV 1, 134 *insano verba tonare Foro.* But St. employs the word also as a term of literary criticism (see also 12-5n.): *intonare* and *tonare* refer to the high style of tragedy and epic in Prop. (after Call. *Aitia frg.* 1, 20 βροντᾶν οὐκ ἐμόν, ἀλλὰ Διός): Prop. II 1, 39-40 *neque Phlegraeos...tumultus/intonet angusto pectore Callimachus.*

But Prop. says it also of Pindar, with a positive intent: III 17, 40 *qualis Pindarico spiritus ore tonat*, see Brouwers 89-90. It is used for epic in Mart. VII 23, 1 (48-53n.), VIII 3, 14 *bella tonare modis, Laus Pis.* 239, or tragedy, see *Silv.* V 3, 98 *terrifico super intonuere cothurno.*

For the transitive use of *detonare*, see II 6, 82-4n.

Philippos: the battle of Philippi does not occur in the *Bellum Civile.* This line and 100-4 (n.) form the only external evidence that the work is unfinished (but see 100-4n.). There can, however, be little doubt that this is so[17]. It seems probable that Polla, and St., had some notion of what Lucan had planned[18] and that this line is an indication of this knowledge. See Vollm., who quotes the prophecy in Luc. I 679-80 *video...Philippos*, Luc. VII 872 *puros...Philippos* and Fr. Differently: Haffter in Rutz 1970, 265 n. 4, Buchheit 1961 (RhM), 364.

Pharsalica bella: St. may refer to Luc. IX 985-6 *Pharsalia nostra/vivet*[19]. But he does not mean to quote the title of the work, for this was almost certainly *Bellum Civile* in Sts.' time, see Bruère in Rutz 1970, 222-5.

The adj. *Pharsalicus*, not surprisingly, occurs in Lucan, e.g. V 391, VII 787, 823 and the phrase *Pharsalico bello* occurs at Plin. *Nat.* V 58, so St. probably has no intention to quote.

For *ossibus*, see Luc. VII 538 *hic numerus totos tibi vestiat ossibus agros*, Sid. *Ep.* III 2, 1 *campos sepultos ossibus insepultis.*

quo fulmen ducis inter arma divi: 'Whither the blast of the divine general went'. After *quo* a *verbum eundi* is omitted, like *ruerit* (Vollm.). This ellipse is not infrequent, e.g. Prop. IV 3, 51 *nam mihi quo* (*ire licet*), Claud. *Rapt.* III 189-90, see *LHSz.* 424 (who also assume the ellipse of *ruerit* here), *TLL* VII 802, 13 ff., Löfstedt 1942², 244.

---

[17] See Bruère in Rutz 1970, 217-56 and Rutz *ibid.*, 201, who show that the battle of Philippi would certainly have been included in the finished work. Differently Haffter *ibid.* 264-76.

[18] That he made a plan seems fairly sure, see Schönberger in Rutz 1970, 277-82.

[19] *Pharsalia nostra* means 'the battle fought by you (Caesar) and described by me (Lucan)', see Housman *app.* and Postgate *comm.*

Domitius conjectured *et* for *quo* (printed by Clouard); Markl. wrote *quod* (printed by Klotz). Saenger, like Phillimore and Traglia, postulated a lacuna, which Saenger fills *exempli gratia* with *heu Romam feriens, volarit igni*, which is applauded by Kl. Damsté (1923, 158) explains *pia* in 68 as an imperative and explains *quo...pia* as *quo facto piabis viros ictos fulmine Caesaris*. Mozley, finally, prints Slater's unfelicitous *convulsum*. But all the conjectures are vain. For the change in construction of *detonabis*, see II 1, 157 ff., II 2, 63 ff.

fulmen is a frequent word to describe a general: Lucr. III 1034 *Scipiadas, belli fulmen*, Verg. *A.* VI 842 (see Norden, who *i.a.* points to Κεραυνός as a nickname for Ptolemy), Luc. X 34, Sil. XV 664, *OLD* 4b, Vollm. at 94, *cf.* Hom. *Il.* XIII 242 ἀστεροπῇ ἐναλίγκιος. St., however, seems to be the first to add an explanatory genitive to it: here, at IV 7, 49-50 *invicti...Caesaris fulmen* and V 1, 103 *Caesarei prope fulmen equi*. See also Verg. *G.* IV 560-1 *Caesar...fulminat Euphraten bello, A.* XII 654, *OLD fulminare* 2.

St. honours Lucan by employing *fulmen ducis divi* (= Caesar, *cf.* I 1, 24 *primus iter nostris ostendit in aethera divis*): when Lucan for the first time wants to illustrate Caesar's doings, he employs the image of lightning: I 151 *qualiter expressum ventis per nubila fulmen*. See also below for allusions to Lucan in *libertate, popularitate* in 70-2.

libertate gravem pia Catonem: 'Cato, venerable because of his patriotic independence'. Cato became proverbial as the personification of Republican and personal (Stoic) freedom, see Otto 1890 no. 358, *Nachträge* pp. 98, 146, 234, MacMullen 2 ff., 18 ff., 27 ff., Vessey 1973, 114-5, Delarue RPh. 1974, 283[20].

St. may allude to Luc. II 302-3 *tuumque/nomen, Libertas et inanem persequar umbram*, IX 96-7 *uni parere decebit, /si faciet partes pro libertate, Catoni*.

gratum popularitate Magnum: *Popularitas* is used in a positive sense here, *cf.* Cic. *Ver.* II 3, 48, Sid. *Carm.* 9, 300 *et carus popularitate princeps*, 23, 400 *popularitate gaudet*.

St. alludes to Lucan's evaluation of Pompey's *popularitas*: I 129 ff. *totus popularibus auris impelli* (132-3), VII 693 ff. *post te pars maxima pugnas non iam Pompei nomen populare per orbem...sed par quod semper habemus, /libertas et Caesar, erit*, see Sid. *Ep.* II 3, 2 *sic ..Gnaeum Pompeium super aemulos extulit nunquam fastidita popularitas*.

Vollm. suggests that St. spares Domitian's sensibilities by praising only Pompey's *popularitas*, while Caesar, Domitian's 'ancestor', is mentioned first and called *divus*. But St. means a climax by finishing with

---

[20] W. Wünsch, *Das Bild des Cato von Utica in der Literatur Neronischer Zeit* (Diss. Marburg 1949) was not accessible to me.

Pompey and dedicating most lines to him here, in the spirit of Lucan's *Bellum Civile*. It is Pompey, not Caesar, who accompanies Lucan in Elysium.

Pompey is called *Magnus* in Lucan from I 122 onwards and esp. frequently in the description of his murder at VIII 600 ff., where *Magnus* occurs 30 times against *Pompeius* 11 times. He earned the *cognomen* by his campaign against the Mariani in Africa, see Plut. *Pomp.* 13.

70-2. Pelusiaci scelus Canopi deflebis: 'The crime of Pelusian Canopus' is the murder of Pompey by the Egyptian king, *cf.* Luc. VIII 536 ff. *adsensere omnes sceleri* (536), *sceleri* (538), *Pelusiaci tam mollis turba Canopi* (543); see 48-53n. *carmen...togatum.*

Pelusiaci: Egyptian. *Pelusium* is a city at the eastern mouth of the Nile, *Canopus* is much more to the west. For this kind of metonymy, where the name of a place is used for a region, see II 1, 178-82n. and add *Th.* I 402 and II 541 *Olenius* for *Tydeus* (who came from Calydon), where *Olenius* is equal to Aetolian (Heuvel on *Th.* I 402); also Ov. *Fast.* II 464-5 *Euphrates* = *Palaestina aqua* where *Palaestinus* means *Syriacus*, the frequent use of *Amyclaeus* for Spartan (I 2, 142 and 213, II 1, 110-1n., IV 8, 29), Fordyce on Catul. 64, 324, Housman on Luc. VII 871, VIII 543, X 9, Lunderstedt 23-31.

The phrase is imitated by Sid. *Carm.* 9, 274 *non Pelusiaco satus Canopo.*

pius: Lucan is *pius*, like Cato (68). Similarly he is *magna...umbra* (116), like Magnus.

Pharo cruenta Pompeio dabis altius sepulcrum: Lucan will give Pompey a grave, to wit his own poem. St. sometimes considers his own *consolationes* as a grave (-monument): III 3, 216 *hoc...sepulcro*, V 1, 15 *haud alio melius condere sepulcro*, see II 1 *Intr.*

In the background is the idea that a monument is transitory, while poetry is immortal, see II 3, 62 ff.n. Lucan himself argues that the absence of a costly grave is a blessing in disguise for Pompey (VIII 865 ff.) *proderit hoc olim quod non mansura futuris ardua marmoreo surrexit pondere moles...bustum...cadet.*

Lucan's monument for Pompey is higher than the Pharos, the lighthouse of Alexandria, *cf.* Hor. *Carm.* III 30, 1-2 *exegi monumentum... regali situ pyramidum altius.* The Pharos is *cruenta* because Pompey's murder stained it.

73-4. Haec...iuvenis canes...ante annos Culicis Maroniani: Lucan will compose this great epic before he was as old as Vergil was when he wrote his *praelusio*, the *Culex* (see I *Praef.* 7 ff.). *Haec* is the *Bellum Civile*, as *iuvenis* (64 *coepta...iuventa*) and the following comparisons show, not 'all your poetry', as Vollm. and Fr. assume.

Lucan died when he was 26. When Vergil wrote the *Culex* he was 16 years of age, according to the text of Donatus' *Vita Vergilii*: *cum esset annorum XVI.* The words of St. here lead most scholars to change XVI into XXVI in the *Vita Vergilii*, see Schanz-Hosius II 76. Only Anderson (225-8) keeps XVI there and must explain St. here as meaning 'before you were 16'. But Lucan could not have started working on his epic that early (see Schanz-Hosius 495-6), and St. would be breaking up the chronological order if he went back here to a stage *teneris in annis* (54)[21].

Though very few modern scholars ascribe the *Culex* to Vergil, St. did, like Lucan (see below) and Martial (VIII 55 and XIV 185).

St. takes up a remark of Lucan which is preserved in Suetonius' *vita Lucani*: *praefatione quadam aetatem et initia sua cum Vergilio comparans ausus sit dicere 'et quantum mihi restat ad Culicem'*. Vollm. (p. 11 n. 1) thinks that this preface belonged to Lucan's *Silvae*[22].

Maronianus is a neologism. It is found after St. in Claud. Mam. *anim.* p. 108, 4, Sid. *Carm.* 9, 220, *Ep.* IV 11, 6, V 5, 2, VIII 11, 3 vs. 23, Scholia on Hor. *Ep.* I 10, 18.

St. also innovates *Maroneus* (IV 4, 54) and *Mantuanus* (IV 7, 27). The Latin adjectives in *-anus* are not common in poetry (esp. not in epic poetry), for reasons of subject (often Greek) and metre. St. innovated five of them: also *Gaianus* (IV 9, 22), *Gauranus* (*Th.* VIII 545, *Silv.* IV 3, 25) and *Pompeianus* (I 2, 265). Only two of them occur in hexameters, see Schamberger 251, 276-7, Speranza 45.

iuvenis primo sub aevo: Is equal to *coepta iuventa* (64). Lucan had only lived through 5 years of *iuventas.*

75-80. Cedet: St. employs one of his favourite formulas, *cedat*, see II 2, 60-2n. The future here implies Sts.' certainty.

A catalogue follows of four poets who wrote long poems in hexameters: Ennius, Lucretius, Varro of Atax and Ovid. Its four members are connected by simple *et.* Two poets are mentioned and characterized and allusions are made to the other two. The most clear example of this catalogue is Ov. *Am.* I 15, 19 ff. *Ennius arte carens...casurum nullo tempore nomen (habet). Varronem primamque ratem quae nesciet aetas, aureaque Aesonio terga petita duci? Carmina sublimis tunc sunt peritura Lucreti exitio terras cum*

---

[21] Cornelissen (285) illogically argues that 74 is an interpolation, made on account of the *vita* by Suetonius.

[22] Whether this is arrogance ('see what I have done before I was 26') or modesty ('I have still a long way to go before I reach the level of the Culex'), St. explains it as proof of Lucan's precocity and greatness. The second view is the more probable one, see Anderson 227-8, Phillimore 106, *Persi Vita* 5 *Lucanus adeo mirabatur scripta Flacci ut vix se retineret recitante eo clamare quae ille faceret, esse vera poemata, sua ludos.* Rostagni on Suet. *loc. cit.* defends the other interpretation.

dabit una dies: St. adds Ovid himself. It seems useless to look for a special reason for each poet here, as Vollm. does (Ennius' *Ambracia* had also a Roman subject, Ovid's *Metamorphoses* are quite different in subject of the *Bellum Civile* (!) *etc.*).

Musa rudis ferocis Enni: See Ov. *Tr.* II 423-4 *Martem cecinit... Ennius...Ennius ingenio maximus arte rudis*, Hor. *Ep.* II 1, 50 *Ennius ferocis... fortis*, Prop. IV 1, 62 *Ennius hirsuta...corona*, Ov. *Tr.* II 259-60 *nihil est hirsutius*, Gel. XII 2, 2 ff., Quint. *Inst.* X 1, 88 *Ennium sicut sacros vetustate lucos adoremus, in quibus... robora... non tantam habent speciem, quantam religionem.*

For *Musa*, poetry, see e.g. Verg. *Ecl.* 3, 84, Ov. *Tr.* III 7, 4, Mart. II 41, 21 *tragicis...vacare Musis*, Quint. *Inst.* X 1, 55 *Theocritus...musa illa rustica, OLD* 2b.

docti furor arduus Lucreti: see *sublimis* in Ov. *Am.* above, and for *ardua*, lofty, V 3, 95 *ardua...sapientia, Th.* X 845 *ardua virtus, OLD* 6. St. employs *arduus* for Luc. in 91 and 102, *cf.* 108.

The juxtaposition of *docti* and *furor* is the same one as in 3 (2-4n.). Cicero also combined these notions in his judgment of Lucretius: *multis luminibus ingenii, multae tamen artis* (*Q.fr.* II 10, 3). It is what Quint. means (*Inst.* X 1, 87), when he says that both Macer and Lucr. are *elegantes in sua quisque materia, sed alter humilis, alter difficilis*[23].

qui per freta duxit Argonautas: Both the place in the catalogue, between Lucretius and Ovid, and the mention in Ovid's catalogue show that Varro of Atax is meant, not Valerius Flaccus. Ovid mentions Varro in an other catalogue (*Ars* III 335-6) between Tibullus and Vergil. Of his free translation of Apollonius' *Argonautica* about 10 quotations remain, see Schanz-Hosius I 312-3.

Vessey (CB 1970, 51-52) argues that it is no great achievement to do better than Varro, quoting Quint. *Inst.* X 1, 87 *Varro Atacinus, in iis per quae nomen est adsecutus interpres operis alieni, non spernendus quidem, verum ad augendam facultatem dicendi parum locuples.* Therefore St. obliquely hits at Valerius here, whose subject was 'old stuff', see 50. But St. mentions only poets who are younger than Lucan. If St. wants us to connect these lines with 48 ff. and explain them as hostile, he would imply that the Aeneid is also 'old stuff' (see 48). And Quintilian only criticizes Varro from the point of view of his usefulness for future orators. Moreover, if we agreed with all Quintilian's judgments it would not be a great achievement to do better than Ovid either (*Inst.* X 1, 88, 93, 98).

For *duxit* and for *transfigurat* in 78, see 57n.

---

[23] Kenney starts from Sts.' qualification *doctus* to connect Lucretius with the *poetae novi.*

qui corpora prima transfigurat: He who metamorphoses former bodies: Ovid. See *Met.* I 1-2 *in nova fert animus mutatas dicere formas/corpora. Prima* may be a reminiscence of *Met.* I 3 *primaque ab origine mundi.*

St. hints at another work of Ov. in I 2, 254-5 *nec tristis in ipsis Naso Tomis.*

transfigurare occurs first in Plin. *Nat.* VIII 181 *transfigurari in lupum*, IX 99, XIII 139 and Sen., see Schamberger 326. It seems to be confined to prose (and does not fit into a hexameter).

79-80. Quid? Maius loquar: M has *loquor* and L *loquar*, written by all editors, except for Vollm. and Clouard (who combines m's *quin* with *loquor*). There is not much to choose between the two. Vollm. defends *loquor* as '*eine kühne, aber zuversichtliche Behauptung*'. But the future tense seems more in accordance with Calliope's speech, see on *exeres* 53. Vollmer's remark applies only to a punctuation *quid maius loquar*? Editors have, from Fr. onward (after Helm, see Fr. *app.*) preferred to put the question-mark after *quid.*

St. may allude to Prop. II 34, 56 *nescio quid maius nascitur Iliade* (see 41-80n.).

ipsa te Latinis Aeneis venerabitur canentem: Even the Aeneid will honour Lucan. See 34-5n., 41-80n. In a similar vein Nero's poetry is put above Vergil's at *Carm. Eins.* 1, 48-9 *ipsa suas deletat Mantua chartas.*

For *Latinis...canentem*, see 45-7, 52-4, 72 *canes. Latinis* emphasizes that both poems appeal to Roman patriotism.

For *venerabitur*, see Th. XII 816-7 *divinam Aeneida...adora.*

81-8.: Praise of Polla, see 41-104n. She is connected to the foregoing by the phrase *non solum...sed*; also because she is interested in poetry (*doctam* 83) and because Calliope herself will sing the wedding song. The whole is one long sentence.

81-3. carminum nitorem: *Nitor* is a term of literary criticism, elegance, see II 2, 9-12n., II 3, 1-5n. It is often used in rhetorical criticism for 'the modern style', see Leeman 262, 367, Delarue RPh 1974, 289 n. 3, Gudeman on Tac. *Dial.* 20, 3 (where the modernist Aper frequently employs *nitor* and *nitidus*), Peterson on Quint. *Inst.* X 1, 83 and 124.

taedis genialibus dicabo: 'I will devote to you by the torches of marriage'. *Genialibus*: G[1]IKQ, *genitalibus*: LM (see on 132). *Genitalis* means 'connected with (pro)creation, birthday' or 'hereditary' (*cf.* II 3, 62-3n.). For *genialis*, connected with marriage, see *Th.* III 300 *genialia foedera Cadmi*, 689, *Ach.* I 113, II 68, *Silv.* I 2, 224, III 3, 108, *OLD* 2. For the frequent confusion between *genialis* and *genitalis* (also both times in *Th.* III), see Fr. *app.* at 132, *TLL* VI 1806, 44 ff.

For *dicare* used in marriage, see Verg. *A.* I 73 (*Deiopeiam*) *conubio iungam stabili propriamque dicabo* and Austin, VFl. III 535.

Calliope takes the place of *Iuno pronuba*, see I 2, 239-40 *dat Iuno verenda/ vincula et insigni geminat Concordia taeda.* But Venus also plays a part at a marriage, both as a giver of beauty and as *Venus pronuba*, see I 2, 51 ff., esp. 65-8, 137-9, 166-8, 182, 194-5, III 4, 53-4, and Vollmer on I 2, 239 for the doublet Venus/Iuno as *pronuba.* Calliope takes over the part of Venus also, as she makes clear in 84.

doctam et ingenio tuo decoram: *ingenio tuo decoram*, suited to your genius, because she is *docta* (II 2, 118-20n., see also 2-4n. here).

For *decorus* in this sense with a dative, see Liv. I 42, 5 *ordinem...vel paci decorum vel bello*, Tac. *Ann.* II 55, 5 *decora feminis, TLL* V[1] 216, 45-72 (with only examples from prose except this line).

84. Venus daretque Iuno: The *apo koinou* with *-que* occurs also at I 2, 127 *Hermum fulvoque Tagum decurrere limo*, 179, I 5, 7, IV 2, 24, IV 3, 83, 213; with a verb followed by *-que* only here.

85-6. forma, simplicitate, comitate, censu, sanguine, gratia, decore: Curtius (289-90) claims that the extension of asyndeton so that the words fill one or more lines is a typical trait of mannerism. He starts with quoting some examples from poets who were certainly no 'mannerists': Lucr. I 685 *concursus, motus, ordo, positura, figurae*, 744 *aera, solem, imbrem, terras, animalia, fruges*, Hor. *Ep.* II 1, 180-1 *gemmas, marmor, ebur, Tyrrhena sigilla, tabellas, / argentum.*

This technique becomes general in St., according to Curtius. But he quotes only 3 examples: *Th.* III 341, VI 116, X 768[24]. Moreover, here St. stands in a tradition without straining it, see Fortgens on VI 116 and *LHSz.* 831 '*Übermäßige Ausdehnung der Asyndeta begegnet zu allen Zeiten*' (who quote only one pre-Christian example from poetry, Sen. *Phoen.* 34).

The question should be how frequent this technique is in hendecasyllabic poetry. No example occurs in Catullus' hendecasyllables. In Martial's hendecasyllables seven examples exist: I 115, 2-3 *cycno, /argento, nive, lilio, ligustro* and 5 *formica, pice, graculo, cicada*, V 20, 8-9 *sed gestatio, fabulae, libelli, / campus, porticus, umbra, Virgo, thermae*, VII 97, 12, X 98, 9, XII 49, 12, XII 97, 3 *dives, nobilis, erudita, casta*; compare I 106, 6 *suspiras, retices, gemis: negavit*, X 76, 5 *iucundus, probus, innocens amicus* (Lindsay's punctuation). In St. it occurs only here and at I 6, 44 *parvi, femina, plebs, eques, senatus.* This may imply that St. and Martial started, very cautiously, to employ a device at times, which returns much more forcefully in Sid., Dracontius and medieval poetry, e.g. Sid. *Carm.* 23,

---

[24] He misquotes III 341 as I 341 and VI 116 is not to the point.

39-44, 168, 457 *forma, nobilitate, mente, censu, Ep.* II 8, 3 l. 6. Markl. even thought 85-6 spurious.

The device here draws attention to the end of the pericope and marks a climax.

forma and *decore* characteristically frame the catalogue, see II 1, 36-136n. For *simplicitas* as praise, see III 1, 32, V 1, 65. For *comitas*: II 1, 168. For *gratia*: II 2, 10, II 6, 41, III 3, 114, III 4, 66, V 1, 66. *Censu, sanguine*: wealth and birth. See for *census* II 1, 163, II 2, 150-3n., II 6, 60-1n. For *sanguis*: III 3, 119, V 2, 178, V 3, 116.

The ablatives all depend on *qualem*, so Saenger's *decentem* for *decore* is unnecessary, and so is Baehrens' proposal (inspired by Gevaert) to transpose 85-6 after 83 *decoram.*

87-8. vestros hymenaeon ante postes...personabo: For *personare* transitively, meaning 'to sing', *cf.* Plin. *Ep.* VII 4, 9 (poetry) *a Graecis nunc cithara, nunc lyra personatur, OLD* 4b and *sonare* at I 4, 96-7 *honora/ carmina...sonuistis*, III 5, 65, IV 2, 66, IV 4, 78, V 3, 14 and 27.

For the whole, see I 2, 237-8 *poste reclinis/quaerit Hymen thalamis intactum dicere carmen.*

89-104.: The lament for Lucan, which, directly after this prophecy of happy marriage, closes Calliope's speech. It is built along parallel lines *o...o...cur...cur...sic...sic...sic...sic.* The thoughts, examples, and formulas are trite, but there is formal variation: 89-90 are exclamations, 91 is an apostrophe and 92 a question; the examples beginning with *sic* are of varying length and syntax; *sic* is followed by an object twice; then it is followed by *ego* and *et tu.*

There is variation in content too: 89 is a general charge against the cruelty of Fate; 90-2 are variations on the thought 'the best die young'. The examples become more and more apt for Lucan with change in the *tertium comparationis*: the great die young (Alexander); the great are overthrown by the small (Achilles); I was shattered by the death of my son, the great poet (Orpheus). The fourth *sic* is a kind of apodosis. It gathers all these aspects together in the person of Lucan, who died young, was murdered by a petty tyrant and was a great poet. The last line, with its double *o* and the charge against *scelus*, points back to 89.

89. saevae nimium gravesque Parcae: See II 1, 120-4n., II 1, 137-57n., II 4, 3n., II 6, 1-2n., II 6, 58-9n.

90-3. nunquam data longa fata summis: The thought 'the best die young', or 'why are the gods so jealous that they want to destroy the greatest qualities of humans?' is age-old: Herod. VII 10, 5, Menand. *fr.* 124 (Kock) ὃν οἱ θεοὶ φιλοῦσιν, ἀποθνῄσκει νέος, Vérilhac 62 B 4 ὡς ἀγαθὸν

πᾶν ὀλιγοχρόνιον (100-150 A.D.), Pl. *Bac.* 816, *CIL* IX 5566, Otto 1890, no. 20, *Nachträge* 41, *cf.* 190-1, II *Praef.* 6-7, II 1, 106-24n., Sen. *Dial.* VI 23, 3, Quint. Inst. VI *Praef.* 10, Mart. VI 29, 7-8 (on Glaucias), Gel. XVII 2, 16 (Cl. Quadrigarius), Vollmer here, E.-F. 138 § 31, Norden on *A.* VI, 868 ff.

Both *summus* and *arduus* are frequent in this *topos*, especially in its most usual development: lightning strikes the highest point. Herod. VIII 10 ὁρᾷς τὰ ὑπερέχοντα ζῷα ὡς κεραυνοῖ ὁ θεός, Lucr. V 1131-2 *invidia quoniam, ceu fulmine, summa vaporant/plerumque et quae sunt aliis magis edita cumque*, Hor. *Carm.* II 10, 11 *feriuntque summos fulgura montes* (with many examples in Nisbet-H.'s note on 9), Otto 1890, no. 727, *Nachträge* 165, Vollm. here and on II *Praef.* 4. See also Ov. *Rem.* 369-70 *summa petit livor*, Sen. *Oed.* 8 *alta ventos semper excipiunt iuga, Oct.* 897, Luc. I 70-1 *summisque negatum stare diu*, V 746-7 *properante ruina/summa cadunt*, Michler 64, *Silv.* V 1, 147-8 *sic alta senescit/imbre seges nimio.*

Fata: R, *festa*: LM, from 88 *festis*, see van Dam 404-5. For *fata*, (span of) life, see III 5, 40, V 3, 72-3, *Th.* II 196, V 21, Ov. *Tr.* IV 1, 86, IV 10, 77, V 5, 62, *OLD* 4a.

saeva vice: A cruel fate; for *vicis*, see Cic. *Dom.* 8, Suet. *Aug.* 66 *vicem suam conquestus est*, see Forc. IV 982 *col.* 1 *sub* 2 '*sors, conditio, casus: et fere cum in peius mutatio fit*'.

Buchheit (1960, 237) is reminded of Verg. *A.* VI 860 ff.; but the correspondences are very general: a prophecy, both Anchises and Calliope cry out (867) and the thought here is similar to 870-1 *nimium vobis Romana propago visa potens, superi.* But 111 here also reminds of *A.* VI and St. may have had the last part of that book on his mind.

93-7.: Alexander and Achilles are two *exempla* of the commonplace *magna non senescunt.* But St. adds pertinent details in the contrast 'great man/small grave', which alludes to Pompey (below), and in the contrast 'great man/weak murderer', which applies to Lucan himself. The detail of the mourning mother in 97 points forward to the next example.

natum Nasamonii Tonantis: Alexander, the son of Zeus Ammon. Alexander was (supposed to be) saluted by the high priest of the oracle of Zeus Ammon as the son of the god, see Curt. IV 7, 25, Plut. *Vit. Alex.* 27. The Nasamones are a people of the coast of Lybia, not of the desert around the oracle, see Plin. *Nat.* V 33, Luc. IX 444. But *Nasamonius* has come to mean 'African': IV 6, 75 (for Hannibal), Sil. I 408, VI 44, Sid. *Carm.* 9, 256, *cf.* II 5, 8-11n.

St. has *Tonans* for Jove 35 times, of which 6 in the *Silvae*, see Heuvel on *Th.* I 421, Mulder on II 69 and 71 ff., Venini on XI 11.

The example of Alexander is inspired by Luc. X 20 ff., Caesar visits the grave of Alexander. See esp. 34-5 *terrarum fatale malum fulmenque quod omnis percuteret pariter populos et sidus iniquum gentibus. Fulmen* has become *fulminatos* here, and *sidus* perhaps inspired *ortus obitusque.* As Fr. (90 n. 1) says, the two images are superimposed here.

LM write *signatum.* G¹HIKQ have *sic natum*, printed by all edd., except for Mar., who follows R in spelling *sic gnatum.* The form *gnatum* almost disappears from poetry after Pl. and Ter. It occurs only in sublime passages in later authors, but not elsewhere in St. or Luc. *Gnatum* occurs twice in Verg. *A.* VI (116 and 869), see Norden on 116. It is difficult to believe that LM preserve *gnatum* here, instead of just misspelling *sic natum.*

For *ortus obitusque* as a reference to celestial bodies and the implicit comparison of royal persons to a star (also in the emperor-cult), see Catul. 66, 2 *stellarum ortus...atque obitus*, Verg. *G.* I 257 *signorum obitus...et ortus*, Apul. *Pl.* I 14, *Epic. Drusi* 409-10 *sideris hoc* (Lucifer's staying away) *obitus terris instare monebat* (of Drusus), I 1, 94 ff. and Fr. 18 n. 1, III 3, 77, IV 2, 59, IV 3, 18, V 1, 241, *Th.* I 24, Sauter 143, Scott 1936, 68, Cancik 1965, 80-1, 98-9.

fulminatus is used in a new sense here by St.: quick like lightning[25], see *fulmineus* for speed and destructiveness since Verg. *A.* IX 812 (*OLD* 2). *Fulminatus* also occurs in the name of the *legio XII fulminata* (*CIL* III 504, 507, 509, *al.*, from Augustan times). That name means "bearer of lightning" (Dio LV 23 κεραυνοφόρον στρατόπεδον), but the emblem of the legion may symbolize its deadly swiftness, see *TLL* VI 1531, 46 ff. The meaning of *fulminatus* in St. is supported by Sid. *Carm.* 23, 95-6 *imperator vitam fulminibus parem peregit.* For Sts.' innovation see Schamberger 279, Speranza 1956, 45, Vollm., II 1, 30-5n. with literature.

angusto...sepulcro: The grave is small because Alexander was such a great man. See *Anth.Lat.* II 15, 13 *sufficit huic tumulus cui non suffecerat orbis*, Juv. 10, 171-2 *cum tamen...intraverit urbem/sarcophago contentus erit.*

Pompey, who is called Magnus, like Alexander (see also Plin. *Nat.* VII 95 *Pompei Magni titulos...aequato...Alexandri Magni rerum fulgore*), had an insignificant grave in Egypt in Lucan's poem: VIII 714 *ne iaceat nullo vel ne meliore sepulcro*, 729, 771 *parvo...saxo*, 793 ff., 816 *miserabile bustum*, 858 ff., *cf.* IX 1 *cinis exiguus...tantam umbram.* See 70-2n. above and on *carmen...togatum* (53), 113n.

angusto is in L, M has *augusto*, see II 4, 11-5n.

Babylon: Alexander died and was embalmed in Babylon, *cf.* Luc. IX 46 *cecidit Babylone sua.* But his body was transferred to Alexandria and

[25] *OLD* 3 explains it wrongly as 'struck with lightning', its only meaning there.

buried there. Caesar visits it there in Lucan's *Bellum Civile*, see above. St. himself implies that Alexander's grave is in Alexandria in III 2, 117-8. For similar conflicting versions in St., see 31-5n.

Perhaps St. puts the grave in Babylon here to emphasize Alexander's travels which brought him to all parts of the world.

fixum Paridis manu trementis Peliden: *Trementis* (: σ, *pr(a)ementis*: LM, see also van Dam 405) illustrates that Paris killed a better man, *cf.* Ov. *Met.* XII 606 *certaque...direxit spicula* (*Phoebus Paridis*), 608-9 *ille igitur tantorum victor, Achille, /victus es a timido Graiae raptore maritae.*

Pelides occurs only here in the *Silv.*, 3 times in the *Ach.*

Thetis horruit: St. characteristically exposes a significant detail, the grief of the mother, see II 1, 92-3n.

98-9. ripis ego...Hebri non mutum caput Orpheos sequebar: Orpheus was lacerated by Maenads in Thrace. His head, still singing, was borne to the sea by the river Hebrus, see Verg. *G.* IV 520 ff., Ov. *Met.* XI 1 ff., Sil. XI 475-80, *RE* XVIII 1281-93. The scene may have been treated in Lucan's *Orpheus*, see 59.

The detail prevails here over the tertium comp.: Calliope paints her own grief (also in V 3, 16-7); the thought 'Orpheus was a great poet, and died young' (*iuvenem*: Verg. *G.* IV 522) disappears behind it.

For *ripis*, along the banks, *cf.* II 3, 10 *fluminibus.*

non mutum: Similarly Lucan was killed when composing poetry (102) and sings in Elysium (114).

For *Orpheos*, see 36-41n.

100-4. et tu (rabidi nefas tyranni) iussus praecipitem subire Lethen: *Rabidi...tyranni* is best put within brackets, after Markl., with Phill., Clouard, Mozl., Mar., Traglia-Ar., Fr. in his translation. For *nefas* in a parenthesis, see II 6, 2-6n. For the word to characterize a (violent) death, see II 5, 11-3n., II 6, 2-6n. and *scelus* in 104, with II 1, 20n., 70 here, E.-F. 139 § 32.

Postgate (1906, 306) explains *nefas* as an apposition with *tu*, 'you are a reproach to the tyrant', quoting Luc. VIII 549-50 *si meruit Magnus/ Caesaris esse nefas.* But there *nefas* rather means *id in quo nefas committitur* (Francken), a victim for Caesar's nefarious lust to kill. The implication 'reproach' seems to be confined to *crimen* and *scelus.*

St. calls Caligula *tyrannus* at III 3, 72; it is one of Lucan's favourite words.

iussus: see *vita Vaccae* (H.) *sua sponte coactus vita excedere, venas sibi praecidit periitque.*

For *subire*, to enter (the Underworld), see II 1, 155, II 6, 98, V 1, 258.

praecipitem...Lethen: 'the impetuous streams of the Underworld': for *praeceps*, see I 5, 25 *praeceps Anien*, III 2, 87 *praeceps Hadria*, Luc. V 640 *praeceps mare*. Lethe is a calm and silent river, but here it stands for '(a river of) the Underworld', *cf.* II 6, 100-2n., see *Th.* VII 782 *rapida Styx*.

dum pugnas canis: See Luc. I 1-2 *bella...canimus*. *Dum* implies 'while you were working on your epic', see 64-9n. Nero is the more *rabidus* for robbing posterity of the complete poem, see Mensching 253-4.

ardua...voce: Because of Lucan's lofty tone, see *generosior* 64. *Voce*, like *canis*, takes us back to Orpheus, and perhaps *Lethen* alludes to *Hebri*.

das solacia grandibus sepulcris: Lucan comforted Pompey in VIII 714 ff., see 72 here (and possibly planned to do the same for other protagonists, see Bruère in Rutz 1970, 252). *Grandibus sepulcris* is contrasted with 95 *angusto sepulcro*, for here the person in the grave is meant, as in V 3, 214, *Th.* IX 786, XII 346, Catul. 96, 1 and Kroll, Ov. *Fast.* II 33 *placatis...sepulchris*.

o dirum scelus o scelus: Heuvel (on *Th.* I 595) takes this as an *accusativus exclamationis* (after Flickinger). He quotes 13 examples of this acc. in St., of which 3 in the *Silv.* But 10 of them are neuter forms, like *scelus, nefas* and it seems rash to explain them automatically, as accusatives, esp. since the acc. exclam. is rare in poetry after Pl. and Ter.: 4 in Verg., 2 in Luc., 2 in VFl., 10 in Sil., see *LHSz.* 48-9. If we leave the neuter forms out of consideration, there remain three instances: IV 7, 31, V 5, 1 and *Th.* XI 338.

tacebis: With this pathetic climax Calliope herself is silent, see II 1, 36n., II 6, 55-7n. *Tacere* is the saddest thing that could happen to Lucan; it is also an euphemism for *mori, mortuus*, words which St. avoids throughout, see 131.

105-6. leviterque decidentes abrasit lacrimas nitente plectro: Most translations take *leviter*[26] with *decidentes* (Mozl., Sb., Traglia-Ar., also Cesareo 123). It rather belongs with *abrasit*. *Abradere* (only here in St.) is a strong word, 'to rub or scrape off, remove by erosion, scrape clean', see *OLD*. *Leviter* qualifies this, *cf.* I 2, 79-80 (*Violentillam*) *summa leviter... lampade...strinximus, Ach.* I 179-80 *leviterque expertos pollice chordas*. Only Fr. and Clouard take *leviter* thus (but Fr. translates it with '*vivement*'). I do not understand Vollmer's explanation, that St. chooses the singular word *abrasit* to picture the Muse who takes the first thing at hand.

For Calliope's using the plectrum as the nearest object and as one of her attributes, see II 2, 100-4n., Prop. III 6, 17 *siccabat lumina lana*.

---

[26] The Concordance does neither distinguish between *lĕvis* and *lēvis*, nor between *decĭdo* and *decīdo*.

The plectrum is *nitens*, shining, because it is made of gold, *cf.* e.g. *Ach.* I 162 *nitet coma...auro, Th.* XI 400-2, III 3, 90, IV 3, 99, V 1, 190, Hor. *Carm.* II 13, 26-7 *aureo...plectro* (with Nisbet-H.), IV 3, 17.

Before she began her speech, Calliope put aside her mourning for Orpheus (39-40); now that she has ended it, she is mourning for Lucan, who has replaced Orpheus (*cf.* 36-41n., 41-80n.).

107-35. Epilogue: The poem ends on a festive and solemn note, returning to its beginning, see *Intr.* under **III**. St. connects *topoi* from the *genethliacon* and from the *consolatio*, and he gathers themes here which he treated earlier in the poem.

The first part is an invocation: *tu...adsis* (107-20). It recalls the usual invocation of the *Genius* at a birthday (see *Intr.* under **I.** and 120-3n.). But the thought that the dead one will return in dreams (or in an other way) is also a commonplace of the *epicedion* (see II 1, 226-34n., II 6, 103-5n.).

107-19 are a kind of description of Lucan's descent into the Underworld, or entering into Elysium, also a standard theme of funerary poetry, see II 1, 183-207n., II 6, 98-103n.

The second part contains the praise of Polla (124-31). It is connected with the first part because Lucan is invoked *vocante Polla.* The praise here is a development from earlier mention of Polla, see 41-104n. She is praised for her unanimity with Lucan (esp. 126-7).

In the third part of the epilogue (131-5) we return to Lucan: not only is he not dead, he is more alive in a spiritual sense than he was (*vitae...origo* 132). Therefore the grief for Lucan is full of joy and turns into adoration (134-5).

107-11. At: M, *ac*: L. For the adversative particle at the beginning of the *consolatio* proper, see II 4, 11-4n.

tu...seu...seu...adsis: The style is hymn-like again (*cf.* 5-11n.), see Hor. *Carm.* III 21, 2-4 *seu tu...seu...seu...descende, Saec.* 13 ff., Apul. *Met.* XI 2, Norden 1912, 144-7, 161. St. has the same structure and content in V 3, 19-28 *At tu seu...in ardua tendens...seu tu Lethaei secreto in gramine campi concilia heroum iuxta manesque beatos Maeonium Ascraeumque senem non segnior umbra accolis alternumque sonas et carmina misces da vocem...pater.*

rapidum poli per axem...levatus: Lifted through the swift sky. St. gives two alternatives, of which the first one is that Lucan has gone to heaven.

The idea that noble souls go to heaven is at home in Greek (esp. Platonist) philosophy: Plt. *Theaet.* 178 e, Stob. I 49, 12 ff. (Wachsmuth p. 378), see Festugière 1949, 441 ff., Fr. 193 n. 1. It was introduced in

Rome by Cicero in the *Somnium Scipionis*: 5 *esse in caelo definitum locum, ubi beati aevo sempiterno fruantur.*

After Cicero it occurs in all kinds of literature: in poetry in general (e.g. *Th.* II 62, Verg. *A.* VI 679 ff., *G.* II 475, Hor. *Ep.* I 12, 15 ff., see Vollm. on V 3, 19, Norden 1912², 18 ff.), in consolatory literature (V 3, 19 ff. above, *Th.* VI 338 ff., Prop. III 18, 31-4, IV 11, 101, *Eleg. Maec.* II 27, *AP* VII 337, 7, Sen. *Dial.* VI 25, 1, see E.-F. 148, 157-8) and in rhetorical precepts (Menand. III 414, 16 ff. with Soffel). In inscriptions it is sometimes said that the dead one (generally a child) has been lifted to the sky and shines with the stars, that is to say has become a star, see Pleket n° 48, 5-6 ἄστροις ἅμα λάμπεις, n° 54, 7 ff. (= Peek n° 861, translated into Latin in *AE* 1945, n° 119, see Pikhaus 215 with n. 552), Vérilhac n° 200 ff.; 201, 9-10, *AE* 1948, n° 107, 5-7 (where the stars and Elysium are also combined, see Pikhaus 211 and n. 537). See Cumont 1922, 91 ff. and 1942 *ch.* 2 and 3. It also plays a part in the emperor-cult, see 93-7n. (*ortus obitusque*).

Though the idea is a commonplace, St. may allude to Luc. IX 1 ff., where Pompey's soul ascends to heaven, see also below.

poli axis is 'the sky', see Verg. *A.* VI 790 *caeli...sub axem*, VIII 28, Sil. XIII 553, see *Th.* III 225 *tonat axe polus* (and Snijder there), XII 560 *dubio caelique Erebique sub axe*, I 2, 212 *ire polo nitidosque errare per axes visus*, *OLD axis* 5a. The phrase *per axem* does not have a parallel in *TLL* II 1638, 38 ff.

For *rapidus*, see *Th.* I 197 *rapidi...caeli*, II 400-1 with Mulder, VI 321 *rapido...axi*, XII 734, Ov. *Met.* II 75, Luc. VI 500 *praecipiti...polo.*

For *levatus* (:q) L has *levatu* and M *levatum.*

Famae curribus arduis: Lucan rides in Fama's chariot as a sign of his poetic fame. That a poet is lifted by fame is a not uncommon concept, e.g. Verg. *G.* III 8-9, Prop. III 1, 8-9 *versus...quo me Fama levat terra sublimis*, VFl. I 10. But a chariot of Fame seems without a parallel, see *RE* VI 1977-9, Roscher I 1442-3, Nisbet-H. on Hor. *Carm.* II 2, 7.

qua surgunt animae potentiores: 'By the way along which the more mighty souls rise'. *Qua* refers to *poli per axem.* There is no need to translate it as 'whither' (Mozl., supported by Håk. 27 n. 27). For *surgunt*, see Ov. *Fast.* VI 735 *surgit humo iuvenis* (a constellation) and phrases like *dies surgit.* Fr. translates '*des régions où naissent les âmes souveraines tu jettes un regard*'. But this is an unnatural explanation of *surgunt*, which introduces a completely new concept.

For *potentiores*, see Luc. IX 5 ff. *Qua niger astriferis conectitur axibus aer...semidei manes habitant, quos ignea virtus...patientes aetheris...fecit...Non illuc auro positi nec ture sepulti perveniunt*, Tac. *Ag.* 46, 1 *si, ut sapientibus placet, non cum corpore extinguuntur magnae animae.*

For the comparative for positive, see on 11 *recentiores.*

terras despicis et sepulcra rides: The literary *topos* 'how ridiculously small and unimportant is the earth' may be traced to technical literature of the first century B.C. which treats the smallness of the earth in relation to the magnitude of the kosmos, see Festugière 1949, 449 ff.

For its application here, see Cic. *Somn. Scip.* 8 *ipsa terra ita mihi parva visa est, ut me imperii nostri...paeniteret*, 12, Sen. *Nat.* I *Praef.* 7-8 *inter ipsa sidera vagantem divitum pavimenta ridere...contemnere porticus...terrarum orbem superne despiciens angustum, Dial.* VI 25, 2 *iuvat...ex alto relicta respicere*, Luc. X 13-4 (Pompey) *vidit quanta sub nocte iaceret/nostra dies risitque sui ludibria trunci*, VI 808 *bustis*, 810 *tumulum* and 113n. below, Drac. *Carm.* 11, 23 *rident sua membra videntes.*

For *despicis* (: Lm; *dispicis*: M, see on *dimittere* at II 4, 18), see II 2, 129-32n.

111-2. seu pacis merito nemus reclusi felix Elysii tenes in oris: For the *topos* of the deceased in Elysium, see II 1, 183-207n., 194-207n.

If the text is right, this must be explained as *felix merito tenes pacis nemus quod est in oris reclusi Elysii.* A number of conjectures have been made, which are not mentioned in modern editions: *paucis* (Heinsius, Damsté 1923, 159), *reclusae* (mentioned as an ancient reading in Gron. *Diatribe* 119 ff.), *meritum* (most pre-17th-century editions, defended in Gron. *Diatribe c.* 22), *reclusum...Elysiis* (Markl.).

Elysii...in oris is very probably wrong: instances of the noun *Elysium* are rare (not in Ov. or Luc.). Where the word occurs, it is almost invariably in the nom. or acc. (but see II 3, 74 and Mart. VII 14, 6 *Elysio*). More significantly, St. always employs *in oris* or *ab oris* with an adjective (*ca.* 15 times) and never with a noun in the genitive. This adj. is often geographical, see *Th.* VI 332, VII 566, VIII 4 *Stygiis in oris*, VIII 319, *Silv.* I 5, 60, IV 4, 22, V 3, 72, *cf.* V 1, 193 *Elysias felix admittar in oras.* The phrase *ab* or *in oris* with an adjective always ends the verse; also at *Th.* I 312, VII 382, *Ach.* II 81, *Silv.* III 2, 37 and 111, *cf.* III 4, 82 *patrias...ad oras.*

Verg., Ov. and Luc. offer 36 examples of *in* or *ab oris* (15, 16, 5). In only two of these there is no accompanying (mostly geographical) adjective or pronoun: Verg. *A.* I 1 *Troiae...ab oris* (obviously a special case) and Luc. IX 370 *Libyae melioris in oris/* (to avoid more repetition of *-is*? But see Housman on Luc. VI 797).

This makes it probable that St. wrote *Elysiis...in oris.* That implies that *reclusi* must also be changed into *reclusum,* as Markl. proposed. See also Luc. VI 782 *Elysias...sedes* with 113n. below.

The *pacis nemus reclusum* is 'the wood of peace, which is open to you'. For the wood in Elysium, see II 1, 202-5n., also for the woods in Verg.

A. VI; see esp. *A.* VI 703-4 *in valle reducta seclusum*[27] *nemus et virgulta sonantia silvae...(et) domos placidas* (see 90-3n.), Ov, *Am.* II 6, 49 *colle sub Elysio...nemus*, 57, Sen. *Her. O.* 956-8, Mart. VII 40, 4, XI 5, 6 *Elysium... nemus.*

See for *nemus pacis* also *Th.* III 97 *pacem...sepulcri*, XI 569 *sedes...quietas*, II 6, 98, III 3, 22 *placidi...manes*, V 3, 286 *nemus, quo nulla inrupit Erinys*, [Sen.] *Oct.* 640, VFl. I 649-50, 113n. below.

merito belongs both with *reclusum* and with *tenes.*

113. quo Pharsalica turba congregatur: *Quo* is not used for *qua*, as Håk. claims (27 n. 27 see on 109 *qua*): *congregare ad* or *in* occurs e.g. at Liv. I 10, 1, Cic. *Phil.* 14, 15, Vitr. VIII 2, 4, Plin. *Nat.* XVII 266.

For *Pharsalica turba*, the (your) heroes of Pharsalus, see *Th.* VII 282 *Heliconia turba*, I 1, 95, Verg. *A.* XI 34, Luc. VI 614 *Thessala turba*, VII 844.

With 112 ff. St. alludes to Lucan's epic: at the end of Bk. VI it is told how those dead ones who favour the Caesarian party come from Tartarus to battle with those illustrious men of Rome's past who support Pompey (780 ff., see 782-3 *Elysias Latii sedes ac Tartara maesta diversi liquere duces* and 112, 117 here. Among The Pompeians is the elder Cato: 790, see 116 here). The supporters of Caesar claim a right to Elysium in view of their victory in the near future (798-9, see Housman), but Pluto *parat...poenam victori* in Tartarus (801-2). For the Pompeys Elysium is reserved: *placido* (see *pacis* in 111 here) *manes patremque domumque expectare sinu regnique in parte serena Pompeis servare locum* (803-5). St. has a similar scene in *Th.* IV 588-92 where Tiresias foresees a Theban victory, because he sees the sorrow of the Argolids of yore in Tartarus. See also 48-53n. *carmen togatum*, on 115 and 116, 107-11n. and 111-2n. above.

114-5. te nobile carmen insonantem Pompei comitantur et Catones: For the idea that poets (still) sing in the Underworld, see V 3, 25-7 *tu...alternumque sonas et carmina misces* (Sts.' father), Verg. *A.* VI 645-7, 662, 667, Hor. *Carm.* II 13, 24 ff. (*te sonantem...Alcaee...mala*: 26-8), Ov. *Am.* III 9, 61 ff., Sil. XIII 781 ff., Nisbet-H. *Intr.* on Hor. *Carm.* II 13.

For *insonare* used transitively (rare), see Verg. *A.* 541 *verbera insonuit*, *Phaed.* V 7, 26-7 *chorus...canticum insonuit* (a conjecture), Mart. Cap. IX 926 *carmen insonui*, *TLL* VII 1940, 30 ff.

nobile: a critical term for the higher *genres* of poetry: I 2, 250-1 *nobile...opus* (epic poetry), Hor. *Ars* 259 *Acci nobilibus trimetris*, *OLD* 7a.

---

[27] *seclusum* for *reclusum* here is attractive, see Norden on *A.* VI 705 for Elysium as a secluded place. But it is not necessary, see for *reclusum* III 3, 27 *penitus via longa patescat*, V 3, 252 *concessit*, Prop. IV 11, 101 *caelum...patuit.*

Pompeii et...Catones: Both Pompeys (father and son) and Cato maior and Cato minor. Lunderstedt, followed by Mozl., explains this phrase as 'people like Pompey or Cato'. This is possible in itself, see for this plural of proper names which refers to a type: Löfstedt 1942[2], 38, Rothstein on Prop. II 24, 25, *LHSz.* 19. It is especially easy here, because 'a Cato' was a proverbial expression for a virtuous man, see 64-9n., V. Max. II 10, 8 *quisquis sanctum et egregium civem significare velit, sub nomine Catonis definiat, RLAC* II 933-4. The older Cato, moreover, has nothing to do with Lucan's poem.

But everything here refers directly to Lucan's *Bellum Civile*: *Pharsalica turba, nobile carmen, Pompeii* (see *Pompeis* in Luc. VI 805, quoted on 113 above). This should also go for *Catones.* The elder Cato is not only included here because the Catos are often mentioned together as *exempla* of virtue: Cic. *Amic.* 21, *Orat.* II 290, III 56, Sen. *Dial.* 25, 1 *excepit illum coetus sacer, Scipiones Catonesque* (in heaven), *Ep.* 70, 20 and 120, 19, Plin. *Ep.* I 17, 3; he is also mentioned in Luc. VI 789-90 together with the younger Cato: *maior Carthaginis hostis non servituri maeret Cato fata nepotis.*

116-9. (tu...nescis Tartaron et...audis...respicis): This is a parenthesis, where Elysium and Tartarus are juxtaposed. Vollm. and Clouard begin the *apodosis* here. Vollm. argues that *tu* picks up *tu* from 107. But in that case *adsis* stands too much on itself. Moreover, if St. said "whether you are in the sky or in Elysium, you are not in Tartarus", this would be much less to the point than 'wherever you are (certainly not in Tartarus), come'. See also Verg. *G.* I 24 ff. *tuque adeo...Caesar...an... anne...quicquid eris* (*nam te nec sperant Tartara regem, nec...nec*) *da facilem cursum atque...annue.*

Some editors read *seu...noscis*: Postg., Phill., Saeng., Mozl., (*seu* is Heinsius' conjecture and *noscis* Haupt's (1876, 531-2)). This is explained as 'you visit Tartarus' (as an interested spectator, like Aeneas). But then *noscis* is something different from 107-15, which refer to the place where Lucan dwells. It would be strange for St. to say 'whether you live here or there, or at the moment are on a visit to Tartarus'.

St. alludes to the *topos* 'the horrors of the Underworld will not harm the deceased', see II 1, 183-207n., esp. V 1, 192-3 *nec Furias nec deteriora videbo Tartara et Elysias felix admittar in oras.*

The juxtaposition of Elysium and Tartarus is very common, see e.g. Tib. I 3, 57 ff. and Smith on 67-82, Verg. *A.* VI 548 ff. St. here connects the contrast Lucan-Nero with it (*tu ...sacer...nocentum...Neronem*), and implicitly Lucan's contrast Pompeians/Caesarians (113n. above).

For *nescis*, you have no experience of, see *OLD* 2a, e.g. Sen. *Oed.* 508 *dum Nerea nesciet Arctos.*

Tartaron: this form of the acc. is not found elsewhere. The regular form is *Tartara* (all 22 other instances of the word in St.; since Lucr.). Similarly St. has *Pergamon* at III 4, 68 (also in *Aetna* 18 and 590) for the usual *Pergama* and *Maenalon* in *Th.* X 639 (also in Ov. *Met.* II 415, *Priap.* 75, 7) for *Maenala*, see Neue-W. I 722-3.

magna sacer et superbus umbra: *Sacer*, inviolable, because you are in Elysium, not in Tartarus. For *superbus*, see II 1, 106-9n.

Whether *magna...umbra* depends on *tu* (as a qualitative abl.) or on *sacer et superbus* (as a causal abl.), it is an abl. which defines the subject, see *Ach.* I 235 (Chiron) *erecto prospectat equo* = I 2, 217, VFl. I 147 *nigro Nessus equo fugit*, II 357 *Pliada...nimboso moverat astro/Iuppiter*, V 227 *magnoque aries apparuit astro.* And for a similar use of the genitive: II 2, 143-6n.

St. alludes to Luc. VI 807-8 *properate mori, magnoque superbi quamvis e parvis animo descendite bustis*, see 113n. above.

procul nocentum audis verbera: The *verbera* are given by the Furies during the trial of the dead and afterwards before the real punishment, see Verg. *A.* VI 557-8 *hinc exaudiri gemitus et saeva sonare verbera, Culex* 376-7 *iam causam mortis, iam dicere vitae,/verberibus saevae cogunt sub iudice Poenae.* The theme is old (since Plt. *Pol.* 361 e), see Norden 1912², 273-5, and on 570 ff., Smith on Tib. I 3, 69-70.

Like Aeneas, Lucan first hears the whips, then sees Tartarus and the guilty: *respicis* 119 (*A.* VI 574 *cernis*, 580 ff. with Norden p. 273 under 3).

nocentum: (: M, *nocentu* L): this form occurs also in *Th.* I 215, II 356, 489. The plur. gen. in *-um*, mostly of participles, occurs 42 times in Sts.' epics, see Heuvel on *Th.* I 215. This is much more frequently than in Verg., for it is found 17 times in the Aeneid, *cf.* Norden on VI 200. In *Silv.* II four instances occur: II 2, 69 *sapientum*, II 4, 1 *volucrum* (more usual, and 11 times in the Thebaid), 121 below *silentum.* See also Neue-W. I 394 ff., esp. 412-3.

For *nocentes*, sinners, see *Th.* I 215, III 3, 4 and 13, Luc. III 13 and esp. VI 799 *turba nocens* (the Caesarians, see 113n. above).

pallidumque visa matris lampade...Neronem: Nero is pale from fear at the sight of his mother's torch. Nero's mother Agrippina, who was murdered by him (Tac. *Ann.* XIV 3-8), persecutes her son, as one of the Furies. See Suet. *Nero* 34 *saepe confessus exagitari se materna specie verberibusque Furiarum ac taedis ardentibus*, [Sen.] *Oct.* 619-21 *ultrix Erinys impio dignum parat/letum tyranno, verbera et turpem fugam/poenasque.* For the torch as an attribute of the Furies, *cf.* II 1, 180-4n., 183n.

pallidus: for fear, see Enn. *scen.* 26 (Joc.) *exalbescat metu*, Hor. *Epod.* 10, 15-6, Ov. *Fast.* II 468 *timore pallet. Met.* XI 111, XIII 74, André 1949, 143. St. may allude to *pallidus* as almost a technical term for things concerning the Underworld, see II 1, 202-5n.

One of the commonplaces of Flavian poetry was the *invectiva in Neronem*, see Mart. VII 21, 3 *Nero crudelis nullaque invisior umbra*, VII 34, 4, VII 44 and 45, see *Silv.* IV 3, 8, V 2, 33. See Brugnoli.

120-3. adsis lucidus: Lucan is invoked (120-2) and arguments why he may not be prevented from coming are given.

For the invocation to the *Genius* in birthday poetry, see Tib. I 7, 49 *huc ades*, II 2, 5, Ov. *Tr.* III 13, 20, V 5, 14, *Intr.* under **I.** here.

Lucidus is an epithet of deities, see *Th.* V 675, Sen. *Oed.* 405 *lucidum caeli decus, huc ades...Bacche, OLD* 1d, II 1, 227-30n. It identifies Lucan with the *Genius*, see 133-5n.

For the nominative instead of the voc. with *adsis*, see *Th.* I 716-7 *adsis o memor*, X 345, Verg. *A.* IV 578, Housman 1933, 3, Svennung 253 ff., *LHSz.* 25.

unum...diem deos silentum exores: St. varies on the *topos* of 'the return of the dead one' (107-35n.) by asking Lucan to return not in a dream, but 'in reality', for one day, his birthday. St. employs a similar theme elsewhere in his *epicedia*: the return to life forever of Alcestis (III 3, 192-3, V 3, 272) and the attempt to return of Eurydice (III 3, 194, V 3, 60, 271-2).

For the idea that the powers of the Underworld will grant a return (*exores* and 123-4), see II 1, 227-30n. (*nec arcet*).

deos silentum: the gods of the dead. For *silentes*, see *Th.* IV 528, VIII 35, Verg. *A.* VI 432, Ov. *Met.* V 356 *rex silentum*, XV 772, Luc. VI 513, Sen. *Med.* 740, VFl. I 750. For the silence in the Underworld, see II 1, 202-5n., *Th.* XII 645.

On the gender of *dies*, see II 1, 222-6n.

solet hoc patere limen ad nuptas redeuntibus maritis: That the door is open to husbands returning to their wives is a hyperbole. Only two instances are known: Sisyphus (Roscher *Lex.* IV 961) and Protesilaos from Phylace.

St. means Protesilaos. He was the first warrior to be killed in the Trojan war (Hom. *Il.* II 695). From the gods he obtained the return for one day (or a few hours, see Hyg. *Fab.* 103, Min. Felix *Oct.* 11, 8, Serv. on Verg. *A.* VI 447) to his young bride Laodamia, *cf.* V 3, 273 *lux una retro Phylaceida rettulit umbram.* Eur. wrote a tragedy called *Protesilaos.* The myth is often treated in literature, see Catul. 68, 75-90, Ov. *Ep.* 13, *Rem.* 723-4, Fr. 91 n. 1, Radermacher 99-111. See also below.

For *limen*, door, (often in St. and elsewhere), see II 4, 11-5n., Lunderstedt 14 (without this line), *OLD* 2a and b.

There exists a story that Laodamia possessed an image of her dead husband, which she surrounded with a Dionysiac cult. St. is the first

author to mention it explicitly (below and at III 5, 49 *quam...quam saevi... fecerunt maenada planctus*), but it seems to be much older: the image of Protesilaos was already important in Euripides' play (see Lesky 380). Ovid alludes to Laodamia's Bacchic frenzy before she knows of Protesilaos' death: *Ep.* 13, 33-4 *ut quas pampinea tetigisse Bicorniger hasta/ creditur, huc illuc, qua furor egit, eo*, see 152 *quae referat vultus est mihi cera tuos*, *Rem.* 723-4 *ceras remove. Quid imagine muta/carperis? hoc periit Laodamia modo.* It is also told by Philostr. *Imag.* II 9.

124-7. Haec te non thiasis procax dolosis falsi numinis induit figura: Polla (*haec*) is favourably compared to Laodamia: she does not need an image of Lucan as Dionysus (*falsi numinis*), but she venerates Lucan himself (*ipsum colit*). In III 3, 192-4 St. ascribes more right to Etruscus to have his father back for one day than to Laodamia; in V 3, 273-5 he does the same thing regarding himself.

Representing and adoring the dead ones as divine figures was a common practice in Sts.' time, also outside the imperial family. In V 1, 231 ff. Priscilla is represented as Ceres, Ariadne, Maia and Venus. See Apul. *Met.* VIII 7, 7 *imagines defuncti, quas ad habitum dei Liberi formaverat*, Suet. *Cal.* 7 *effigiem habitu Cupidinis* (of Caligula's dead son), Lact. *Div. Inst.* V 4, *CE* 1508, 7, Vollm., Fr. 182 n. 5, *SG* III[10] 79.

thiasis procax dolosis: *procax*, immoderate, refers to her behaviour as a Maenad, see I 5, 13 *procax vittis hederisque*. *Dolosis* alludes to the story that Laodamia's cult of Bacchus/ the dead Protesilaos was a fake, intended to avoid a second marriage, which her father wanted to impose on her, *cf.* Hyg. *Fab.* 104, 1 *sub simulatione sacrorum*. For Sts.' care in fitting his examples and comparisons with relevant details, see II 6, 25-8n., 30-3n.

ipsum sed colit et frequentat ipsum: Mart. VII 23, 3-4 *Tu, Polla, maritum/saepe colas et se sentiat ille coli*, St. says of his mother in V 3, 242-3 *te sentit habetque/te videt.* For *frequentat*, see 1n. For Polla each day is a day of Lucan.

imis altius insitum medullis: 'Fixed in her inmost marrow'. *Medullae* is mentioned as the seat of love in Eur. *Hipp.* 255 πρὸς ἄκρον μυελὸν ψυχῆς, in Latin since Pl. *Mos.* 243, e.g. Cic. *Fam.* XV 16, 2, *Dirae* 101; in St.: *Ach.* I 304. See Pease on Verg. *A.* IV 66: 'the marrow typifies the innermost citadel...but with this there is undoubtedly combined the idea of secrecy and freedom of observation'. Polla, instead of ostentatiously adoring an image of Lucan, enjoys a communion with the real Lucan in her heart. Note the secular use of the religious terms.

For *altius*, comparative for positive, see on 11 *recentiores*.

For *insitus*, see Cic. *Ver.* 5, 139 *causa...in animo sensuque meo penitus adfixa atque insita*, Luc. IX 572, *OLD* 3. See also Luc. IX 71-2 *non imis haeret imago visceribus?*

128-31. ac solacia vana subministrat vultus qui simili notatus auro stratus praenitet incubatque somno. Securae procul hinc abite, Mortes: This is in LM (except that L has *ad* for *ac*). Slater's *at* for *ac* (1907, 156) is printed by Phill., Fr., Mar., Sb. All edd. (except for Baehr.) accept *stratis* (σ) for *stratus.*

Explanations of these difficult lines can be divided into two kinds: those who contend that Polla does not have an image of Lucan, because those images give only vain comfort: apparently Cesareo 126-7, Fr., Buchheit 1960, 248-9, Traglia-Ar. And, on the other hand, those who make St. say that Polla has got an image of Lucan, but that this is not very important to her: Vollm., Skutsch (1893, 831), Mozl., Clouard, Sb., Nisbet 1978, 10-1.

Those who maintain that Polla does not have an image, explain the lines in a general fashion: 'a face (an image) which shines above beds and watches over the sleep does only give vain comfort'. That is, other people need such things, but Polla does not. They argue that St. can only contrast Laodamia and Polla if Polla does *not* have an image of her dead husband, and that 126-7 prove that such is the case. Fr. prints *at*, to secure this contrast, but this seems unnecessary in either explanation, see van Dam 405-6.

But it is very improbable, I think, that anyone would understand *solacia, vultus* and especially *stratis* in so general a way. It seems natural to make them refer to Polla. Polla and Laodamia are contrasted, because for Polla the image of Lucan which is in her bedroom is only subsidiary (*subministrat*): unlike Laodamia, she reveres Lucan in her heart; his portrait is a support, but it is not essential (*vana*)[28].

It was usual to have portraits of the deceased at home, see II 1, 191-3n., Nisbet 1978, n. 94 for more literature. Other authors also concede that there is nothing against portraits, as long as they do not become more important than other things: Tac. *Ag.* 46, 3 *id filiae quoque uxorique praeceperim...ut...formamque ac figuram animi magis quam corporis complectentur, non quia intercedendum putem imaginibus quae marmore aut aere finguntur, sed ut vultus hominum, ita simulacra vultus imbecilla ac mortalia sunt, forma mentis aeterna*, Plin. *Ep.* II 1, 12 *Verginium cogito, Verginium video, Verginium iam vanis imaginibus recentibus tamen, audio alloquor teneo* and *CE* 480, 4 ff. *marmoreos vultus statuit, oculos animumque, /longius ut kara posset saturare figura./ hoc solamen erit visus. nam pignus amoris/ pectore contegitur memori dulcedine mentis/...toto est in corde maritus.* In a different context: Sen. *Ep.* 40, 1.

Elsewhere St. confines himself to praising the survivors for keeping the memory of the dead with portraits: II 1, 191 ff., III 3, 200 ff., V 1, 9 and 230-4.

---

[28] Baehrens' *vera* for *vana* misses this point, and really leaves no contrast between Polla and Laodamia. So does Peyrarède's (see van Dam 405) *nec*, if it is taken with *vana.*

For his inconsistencies, or adaptation to the demands of each single poem, see 31-5n.

The phrase as a whole means: 'and your portrait carved in gold, which resembles you, gives her empty comfort, shining over her bed and watching over her sleep; she is untroubled' (see below).

For simili...auro, see II 1, 191-3n., Ov. *Tr.* I 7, 1 *nostris similes in imagine vultus*, 7 *effigiem...meam fulvo complexus in auro, Ep.* 13, 152 A.

For *notatus*, expressed, see Cic. *De Orat.* II 357 *res caecas...confirmatio quaedam et imago...notaret, OLD* 9c.

praenitet, 'shines very brightly', see *OLD* a. The abl. *stratis* is local. MacMullen 77 claims that II 7 and Mart. VII 21-23 were meant for display near Lucan's portrait. But there is no proof or parallel for this singular idea (for Mart. VII 44, which he quotes, proves nothing of the kind).

incubatque somno: Markl. proposed *excubat*, see II 2, 22, Suet. *Cl.* 37, 2 *pro salute sua excubaret*: for the dative, see Fro. *Ver.* 2 p. 152 (134 N.) *ut excubaret etiam aegro mihi*, Plin. *Nat.* XXXV 118 (*pictorum*) *ars urbibus excubabat.*

Markl. may be right: *incubare* is generally unfavourable (except for technical uses as 'sleeping in a temple', 'to brood over, keep a jealous watch over'), e.g. *Th.* X 302-3 *tali miseris deus aliger umbra incubat* (a nightly slaughter), see *OLD.* But *incubat* in II 3, 55 is positive (in spite of its negative associations), and *cf.* V 1, 200-1 *ore ligato incubat amissae.* I think that *incubat* can be kept here.

securae: all mss. have a full stop before *securae.* Gronovius, followed by most editors, deleted this and punctuated after *securae.*

Buchheit (1960) defending his interpretation of 128-30, wanted to restore the full stop after *somno.* He argues that enjambment is very rare in Sts.' hendecasyllables, and that it is only used for special purposes. The first claim is not untrue, but the second one is, see 122, I 6, 80, IV 3, 80, 98, 125, IV 9, 6. He adduces two formal parallels for *securae... Mortes*: Priap. 8, 1 *matronae, procul hinc abite, castae* and Mart. XI 6, 6 *pallentes, procul hinc abite, curae.*

Although the last one, especially, is a good formal parallel, *securae... Mortes* can have no meaning. Buchheit quotes Ov. *Met.* XIV 490 *secura summa malorum* and Mart. VII 47, 5-6 *secura...tristitia.* But these are not enlightening.

On the other hand (*Pollae*)...*securae* is very good: it marks a climax, for Polla is untroubled, though it is not the portrait which effects this. *Vana* and *securae* are a typically Statian paradox.

Nisbet (1978, 9-11) sees an allusion to Epicurean beliefs in *securae,* just as the secular meaning of the religious words in 125 points to

Epicureanism (see also below). He employs this as an argument for his identification of Lucan's widow with *Polla Felicis*, see *Intr.* under **IV**. But this is hardly conclusive, either for Epicureanism or for the identification.

131. Procul hinc abite, Mortes: The personification of *Mors* is common; for the plur. see *Th.* VIII 24 *Furiae...variaeque Mortes*, Dracont. *Romul.* 8, see Roscher *Lex.* III 2164, Norden on *A.* VI 273 ff., *OLD* 2. St. may have been inspired by *Fata* and other plurals for the use of the plural here (II 1, 120-4n.) or possibly by Greek Κῆρες. But it seems probable that he draws on Verg. *A.* VI 273 ff. *Luctus, Curae, Morbi, Gaudia*, imitated by *Sil.* XIII 581 ff.

The contrast with *vitae* alone (132) shows that conjectures are unnecessary (*curae...inertes*: Heinsius, see van Dam 406 for more).

132. haec vitae genitalis est origo: All edd., except for Markl. and Clouard, change *genitalis* (:LM) into *genialis* (: σ). They explain *genialis* as 'connected with marriage', referring to 82 (see 81-3n.), and translate the sentence as 'this is the beginning of (real) married life'. Mozl. and Cesareo (120, 128, 131 ff.) refer it to the *Genius*, but it is unclear why *vita genialis* should mean 'sustaining life' (Mozl.). And, as Markland put it, *quid morti cum die natali*? (on II 3, 62).

I think that *genitalis* is right (defended also by Merrill 100, Ziehen 1904, 646). Fr. claims that St. adapted Lucretius' *rerum genitalis origo* (V 176, 324 with *terrarum*, 1212 with *mundi*). But why should he not have taken it over: *genitalis origo* is 'birth', 'beginning'. This gives a much sharper contrast with *Mortes*: St. does not say that this day (*haec*) is the beginning of married life, but he returns to Lucan and says that this day is the beginning of Lucan's life.

Nisbet (1978, 10-1) also advocates *genitalis* and connects it with the Epicurean interest in birthdays (not, strangely enough, with Lucr.).

133-5. Cedat luctus: At the end St. returns to the festive mood of the beginning, see *Intr.* under **III.**, 107-35n. Just as Calliope put away her mourning when 'adopting' Lucan, everyone's grief must end now.

genisque manent iam dulces lacrimae: Both *lacrimae manant* (Liv. V 7, 11, Hor. *Ep.* I 17, 59, see *Th.* XI 540) and *genae manent lacrimis* are possible, *cf.* II 1, 230-4n. The emphasis is on *iam dulces*, tears which now are sweet. For the oxymoron, see II 1, 60-1n. *Genae* meaning 'eyes' is noted as an archaism by Klotz 1908, 410-1 (see II 3, 12-4n. *Celica tecta*), because this sense occurs in Enn. (*Ann.* 532 V., *scen.* 224 Joc.), *cf.* Paul. Fest. 94, 6 M. But St. took over the word in this meaning from the Augustans, see II 1, 230-4n., Cancik *Forschungsbericht* p. 7.

dolorque festus, quicquid fleverat ante, nunc adoret: 'Let grief, festive now, adore what it hitherto has mourned'. *Iam* is *apo koinou. Dolor* is the subject of *adoret.* Fr. and Traglia-Ar. take *dolor* as Polla's grief (and *lacrimae* as Polla's tears) and Polla as the subject of *fleverat.* But I think that St. is more general here: he exhorts everyone (his public; or, if one wants a more specific reference, the participants of the feast) to adore Lucan (*quicquid* is almost equal to *quem*). Of course this goes first and foremost for Polla, but Sts.' claim is chiefly for Lucan's immortality. The oxymora (*dulces lacrimae, dolor festus*) and the contrasts *fleverat/adoret, ante/nunc* point to an attempt at bridging the gulf between life and death.

For the oxymoron *dolor festus*, see *Th.* VII 788 *pulchrum furorem*, II 6, 44-6n. *horrore decoro*, Sid. *Carm.* 9, 208 *furore festo.* Nisbet (1978, 11) inevitably sees a reference to Epicurean εὐωχία, see on *securae* above.

Adoret points back to *frequentet* (1) and *colitur* (23): St., in a way, deifies Lucan.

APPENDIX

Speeches in the *Silvae*[1]

Speech		*Speaker*
1.	I 1, 74-83	Curtius
2.	I 2, 65-102	an Amor
3.	I 2, 106-40	Venus
4.	I 2, 162-93	Venus
5.	I 4, 61-105	Apollo
6.	II 3, 24-6	Diana
7.	II 3, 43-52	Pan
8.	II 7, 41-104	Calliope
9.	III 1, 91-116	Hercules
10.	III 1, 166-83	Hercules
11.	III 3, 182-204	Etruscus iunior
12.	III 4, 32-45	Venus
13.	III 4, 95-7	Venus
14.	IV 1, 17-43	Ianus
15.	IV 3, 72-94	Vulturnus
16.	IV 3, 124-63	Sibylla
17.	IV 4, 12-77	Statius
18.	V 1, 177-193	Priscilla
19.	V 1, 239-41	(aliquis)
20.	V 2, 83-96	Crispinus
21.	V 2, 144-9	(barbarus)
22.	V 5, 47-8	(aliquis)

The speeches are distributed over 14 poems. In 18 poems no speeches occur (I 3, 5, 6, II 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, III 2, 5, IV 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, V 3, 4). The total amount of lines is *ca.* 515½, out of 3793 = 13%. For the Thebaid this is 37%, for the Achilleid 40%, Sil. 31%, VFl. 34%, Luc. 32%, Verg. 46-75% (all figures after Lipscomb 1909, except for those concerning Vergil, which are taken from Highet 1972). Even if only the lines of those poems where speeches occur are counted, which seems reasonable (2079 lines), the proportion of speeches is only 25%.

---

[1] Of Sts.' own words I have only counted IV 4, 12-77 as a speech, where St. speaks to his letter to Marcellus, introduced by *haec verba* (11) and concluded by *haec ego...sonabam* (78). I exclude II 4, 22 ff. (*hoc carmen*) and the prayers opening III 2 and III 4. See also II 3, 24-26 (footnote).

A)	*Shortest speeches:*[2]	22 (2 lines), 19 (2½ lines), 11 (3 lines).
B)	*Longest speeches:*	17 (66 lines), 8 (63½ lines).
C)	*Greatest number of speeches in one poem:*	3 (I 2, numbers 2, 3, 4).
D)	*Greatest proportion lines of speech per poem:*	17 (63%), 14 (57%), 8 (47%), 3 (38%), 5 (34%).
E)	*Speakers:*	
	A) *Divinities:*	15 = 68% (1-10, 12-16)
	B) *Humans:*	7 = 32% (11, 17-22).

A) The shortest speeches in epic consist of one or a few words (*aquae*: *Th.* IV 805, 806, *mater*: *Th.* IX 350, *Crenaee*: *Th.* IX 356, see Highet 1972, 11 n. 15, correcting Lipscomb 1909, 15): three words in Sil., four in Luc. and Verg., five in VFl.

B) Long speeches in epic are almost always much longer than in Sts.' short poems. In VFl. however, the longest speech is 72 lines. Note also that St. has relatively many long speeches in the *Silvae*: in the Thebaid occur 6 speeches of over 40 verses; in the *Silvae* 3 speeches are longer than 40 vss.: numbers 5, 8, and 17, while 16 has 40 lines. The expected number would be 2, 34 in proportion to the length of the Thebaid.

D) Only the 5 mentioned speeches surpass the proportion of speech in the Thebaid, or fall only little below it (see above). This implies that the other poems where speech is found contain it only in a (sometimes very) small proportion, e.g. 11 (10%), 1 (9%), 18 (7%) and 22 (2%; but the poem is incomplete).

E) Under divinities all mythological figures are included. The proportion of speakers from mythology is high: in the Thebaid and Silius 15% of the speeches is allotted to supernatural agents, in VFl. and Vergil 19% (in Lucan, of course, almost none). See Lipscomb 1909, 18-20. The figure in the *Silvae* is very much higher, emphasizing the important part of mythology in it (see II 1, 88-102n., II 3 *Intr.*).

---

[2] The speeches are indicated by the number heading them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The main purpose of this bibliography is to elucidate references occurring in the commentary. Therefore the term 'bibliography' is somewhat misleading: this is rather a bibliographical key. On the other hand, as far as bibliographic reports, editions and translations of the *Silvae* or parts of the work from after 1817 are concerned, I have tried to be exhaustive. And under *Literature* a fair number of works is included which are not quoted in the commentary. The reader should bear in mind, however, that literature dealing with other poems in the *Silvae* than those in the IInd book has not been systematically included. Bibliographic work, editions, commentaries and secondary literature about Statius' epics are mentioned here only if they have been referred to in the commentary. For abbreviations of periodicals I have adhered, as far as possible, to *l'Année Philologique.*

BIBLIOGRAPHIES

E. Baehrens, *Jahresbericht über die römische Epiker für 1875-1876.* JAW 4 (1876), 149-58. (A few references to the *Silvae*).

H. Genthe, *Jahresbericht über die römische Epiker für 1880.* JAW 22 (1880), 143-207. (A few references to the *Silvae*).

J. Tolkiehn, *Bericht über die nachaugusteischen Epiker, Senecas Tragödien, Ausonius, die Bukoliker und die lateinische Anthologie von 1903-1906.* JAW 134 (1907), 196-236. (Statius on pp. 216-29).

J. Tolkiehn, *Bericht über die nachaugusteischen Dichter (mit Ausnahme der Lehrdichtung, Fabel und Satire) von 1907-1910.* JAW 158 (1912), 1-95. (Statius on pp. 48-62).

J. Tolkiehn, *Bericht über die nachaugusteischen Dichter (mit Ausnahme der Fabel und Satire) von 1911-1914.* JAW 171 (1915), 1-94. (Statius on pp. 53-9).

M. Schuster, *Bericht über die nachaugusteischen Dichter (mit Ausnahme von Seneca tragicus, der Fabel und Satire) von 1915-1925. I. Teil. Das erste nachchristliche Jahrhundert.* JAW 212 (1927), 73-167. (Statius on pp. 131-44).

R. Helm, *Nachaugusteische nichtchristliche Dichter I. Römische Dichter von Tiberius bis Trajan. Bericht über das Schrifttum der Jahre 1925-1942.* Lustrum 1 (1956), 121-318 (Statius on pp. 272-99. *Silvae* esp. on pp. 288-97).

H. Cancik, *P. Papinius Statius als römischer Lyriker. Forschungsbericht zu Statius' Silven seit Friedrich Vollmer.* To appear in ANRW II (Principat) Rubrik Sprache und Literatur. (With bibliography).

EDITIONS, COMMENTARIES, TRANSLATIONS[1]

Anonymus, *Sylvarum libri quinque.* Venezia 1472. (Ed. princeps. Together with Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius)[2].

---

[1] I have tried to include all editions *etc.* of (parts of) the *Silvae* from Hand's edition with commentary of I 1-3 of 1817 onwards. A survey of older editions is given there on pp. XXVIII-LIV. The most important of those editions are mentioned here. Works which I have not seen are marked with an asterisk.

[2] There is no evidence for Marastoni's ascription of this edition to Dom. Calderini (ed. p. XLIII, XC, followed by Traglia ed. p. XXXI), see Reeve 207, 211.

Dom. Calderini, *Sylvarum libri quinque.* Roma 1475. (With preface and commentary).
Ioh. Bernartius, *Ad P. Stati Papini Silvarum libros Commentarius.* Antwerpen 1599.
I. C. Gevartius, *P. Papinius Statius, opera omnia.* Leiden 1616.
M. de Marolles, *Les Sylves et l'Achilléide de Stace avec des remarques en Latin & en François. Cum notis de Guyet et Peyrarède.* Paris 1658.
C. Barth, *P. Papinius Statius, quae exstant, Caspar Barthius recensuit et animadversionibus locupletissimis illustravit.* Zwickau 1664.
J. Markland, *P. Papinii Statii libri quinque Silvarum, ex vetustis exemplaribus recensuit et notas atque emendationes adjecit Jer. Marklandus.* London 1728. (*Editio auctior indicibusque instructa* Dresden/London 1827).
Stud. Societatis Bipontinae, *Statii opera. Praemittitur notitia litteraria.* Zweibrücken 1785. (With an extensive *index editionum* from 1472 up to 1785).
F. Hand, *P. Papinii Statii Silvae, recensuit et cum notis Gronovii Marklandi aliorumque et suis edidit Ferdinandus Handius.* I Leipzig 1817 (Only I 1-3).
Valpy, *Statii Opera. Ex editione Bipontina, cum notis et interpretatione in usum Delphini, variis lectionibus, notis variorum, recensu editionum et codicum et indice locupletissimo accurate recensita.* London 1824.
Rinn & Achaintre, *Œuvres complètes de Stace.* Tome I. Paris 1829. (Text, French translation, notes).
*Doelling, *Silvae.* Programm Plauen 1837-47. (German Translation: I 1 Programm Plauen 1837, I 2 Programm Plauen 1839, I 3 *ibid.* 1838, I 4 *ibid.* 1841, I 5 *ibid.* 1841-2, V 3 *ibid.* 1843, II 1, 2, 3 *ibid.* 1844-5, III 1, IV 8 *ibid.* 1843-4, V 1 *ibid.* 1846-7).
*Ed. Nisard, *P. Papinius Statius, œuvres complètes, avec la traduction en français de Guiard.* Paris 1842 (Collection des auteurs latins T. 24).
*F. Hand, *P. Papinii Statii Hercules Epitrapezios Novi Vindicis.* Progr. Jena 1849. (*Silv.* IV 6).
*G. Queck, *Statii Silv. I 4 e codicibus et schediis Handii.* Arch. f. Philol. 18 (1852), 121-32.
*G. Queck, *P. Papinius Statius.* Leipzig 1854 (Teubner).
*D. A. Sundén, *Silva quaedam Pap. Statii (III 2) versibus suethicis expressa, cum prooemio et adnotationibus.* Diss. Stockholm 1860.
*C. Volckmar, *Specimen novae Silvarum Statii editionis.* Progr. Ilfeld 1860. (*Silv.* I 1).
*A. Imhof, *Ecloga ad uxorem emendavit et adnotavit.* Progr. Halle 1863. (*Silv.* III 5).
*R. Unger, *P. Papinii Statii ecloga ultima (V 5). Accedunt de Statii locis controversis coniectanea.* Neu-Strelitz 1868.
E. Baehrens, *P. Papinii Statii Silvae.* Leipzig 1876 (Teubner). (Last text to appear before the discovery of M).
*A. Herzog, *Statii Epithalamion.* Diss. Leipzig 1881. (*Silv.* I 2).
A. W. Verrall, *The Feast of Saturn.* In Ed. M. A. Bayfield & J. D. Duff, *Collected Literary Essays Classical and Modern* (Cambridge 1913), 58-84. (Translation and essay about I 6).
O. Lottich, *Statius' Trostgedicht an den Claudius Etruscus (Silv. III 3) mit sachlichen und kritischen Erklärungen.* Hamburg 1893.
*W. Lundström, *Quaestiones Papinianae.* Diss. Uppsala 1893. (*Silv.* V 5).
A. Klotz, *Curae Statianae.* Diss. Leipzig 1896. (*Silv.* II 2. Text and comm.).
F. Vollmer, *P. Papinius Statius, Silvarum Libri.* Leipzig 1898 (Hildesheim 1971 repr.). (Intr., text, and the most recent and influential full commentary on the whole of the *Silvae*).
A. Klotz, *P. Papinii Statii Silvae, Krohnii copiis usus edidit.* Leipzig 1900 (Teubner). (Second ed. Leipzig 1911, with a new conclusion as to the transmission of the text).
*R. Sebicht, *P. Papinius Statius, Silvae I-IV übersetzt.* Ulm 1902. (German translation).
*C. H. Moore, *Statius. Silvae.* Boston 1903 (Translation).
J. P. Postgate & G. A. Davies, *P. Papinius Statius, Silvarum libri V.* London 1904. (*CPL*).
J. S. Phillimore, *P. Papini Stati Silvae.* Oxford 1905. (*OCT*). (Second edition 1917, repr. 1967).
*D. A. Slater, *The Silvae of Statius Translated, with Introduction and Notes.* Oxford 1908. (Repr. 1968).

G. Saenger, *P. Papini Stati Silvae, varietatem lectionis selectam exhibuit Gregorius Saenger.* St. Petersburg 1909. (Text).
*Desideri, *Silvae I 3.* Roma 1913.
Gaar & M. Schuster, *Auswahl aus römischen Dichtern.* Wien 1924-26. (*Silv.* IV 1 and V 4 on pp. 83 ff.).
J. H. Mozley, *Statius, with an English Translation.* London/New York 1928. (Loeb Classical Library).
*J. E. Hylen, *Silvae överset i origin. versm.* Nyköping 1928. (Swedish translation).
*G. Sozzi, *P. Papinio Stazio. Selve.* Milano 1929. (Coll. Romana). (Italian translation).
H. Clouard, *Stace, Silves.* Paris 1935. (Coll. Garnier). (Text, French translation and a few notes).
*I. Lauro, *Stazio, l'epitalamio con commentario.* Portici 1938.
G. Wijdeveld, *P. Papinii Stati Silvae — V, 4 Aan den Slaap.* Hermeneus 13 (1940-41), 32-3. (The only Dutch translation of any part of the *Silvae*).
*L. Illuminati, *Silvae, I, con traduzione e note.* Messina 1941.
H. Frère, *Les Silves de Stace. Edition critique.* Diss. Paris 1943. (Intr. and text).
H. Frère, *Stace, Silves.* Paris 1944. (Coll. Budé. Repr. 1961). (Intr., text and extensive notes by H. Frère. French translation by H. J. Izaac).
R. Argenio, *Al Sonno* (*Statii Silv. l. V, 4*). *Alla moglie Claudia* (*Statii Silv. l. III, 5*). MC 2 (1948), 68-73. (Italian translations).
R. Argenio, *L'albero di Atedio Meliore* (*Stat. Silv. II 3*). MC 4 (1950), 135-7. (Italian translation).
*G. Colom & M. Dolç, *Silvae.* Barcelona 1957-60 (3 vols.). (Text and Catalan translation). (See Reeve 215 n. 49).
A. Marastoni, *P. Papini Stati Silvae.* Leipzig 1960. (Teubner. Ed. stereotypa correctior 1970).
*F. Sbordone, *Stazio. Le Selve. Testo e apparato critico.* Vol. I Napoli 1960. (*Silv.* I-II).
*A. Marsili, *Statii Silvae.* Pisa 1960. (Text).
*R. Argenio, *Stazio. Epistola lirica a Vibio Massimo.* RSC 9 (1961), 213-6.
F. Sbordone, *Stazio. Le Selve. Testo e apparato critico, con antologia di traduzioni e note.* Napoli 1970. (Text of III 3, III 4, IV 4, IV 5, IV 6, IV 7, IV 8, IV 9, V 1 and V 2 is missing—without warning. Of the other poems only a selection has been translated. The notes number 60 in all, none of them longer than two lines).
R. Argenio, *Due Selve di Stazio commentate e tradotte* (*Silvae I, 5 e 6*). RSC 20 (1972), 13-22. (Text, introduction, Italian translation and some notes).
R. Argenio, *Due epicedii di Papinio Stazio* (*Silv. II 1; V 5*). RSC 20 (1972), 331-62. (Text, introduction, Italian translation, some notes).
P. Jay, *Eight Latin Poems.* Arion 1 (1973-4), 496-504. (A.o. part of *Silv.* IV 5).
S. Barthèlemy & D. Gourevitch, *Les loisirs des romains.* Paris 1975. (Translations of *Silv.* II 2, 40-146 on pp. 34-8, II 4 on pp. 68-9, II 5 on p. 76, I 5, 34-65 on pp. 142-3, I 6, 9-102 on pp. 168-71).
M. von Albrecht, *Römische Poesie. Texte und Interpretationen.* Heidelberg 1977. (*Silv.* V 4, text, German translation and interpretation on pp. 256-61).
A. Traglia, *P. Papini Stati, Silvae.* Torino 1978. (Corpus Paravianum).
A. Traglia & G. Aricò, *Opere di Publio Papinio Stazio.* Torino 1980. (Coll. classici Latini). (With intr., text, Italian translation, notes).

EPICS

H. W. Garrod, *P. Papini Stati Thebais et Achilleis.* Oxford 1906. (*OCT*).
M. R. J. Brinkgreve, *Statii Achilleis brevissima annotatione critica, locis quibusdam parallelis vel comparandis, commentario exegetico instructa.* Diss. Groningen 1913.
H. Heuvel, *Publii Papinii Statii Thebaidos Liber Primus versione Batava commentarioque exegetico instructus.* Diss. Groningen 1932 (Zutphen).
H. W. Fortgens, *P. Papinii Statii de Opheltis funere carmen epicum, Theb. Lib. VI 1-295, versione Batava commentarioque exegetico instructum.* Diss. Utrecht 1934 (Zutphen).

O. A. W. Dilke, *Statius: Achilleid.* Cambridge 1954. (Text and comm.).
H. M. Mulder, *Publii Papinii Statii Thebaidos Liber Secundus commentario exegetico aestheticoque instructus.* Diss. Groningen 1954. (With extensive bibliography).
H. Snijder, *P. Papinius Statius, Thebaid. A Commentary on Book III.* Diss. Amsterdam 1968.
P. Venini, *P. Papini Stati Thebaidos Liber Undecimus. Introduzione, testo critico, commento e traduzione.* Firenze 1970.
R. D. Williams, *P. Papini Stati Thebaidos Liber Decimus.* Leiden 1972. (Text and comm.).
J. J. L. Smolenaars, *P. Papinius Statius, Thebaid. A Commentary on Book VII, 1-451.* Diss. Amsterdam 1983.

LITERATURE

W. Abel, *Die Anredeformen bei den römischen Elegikern.* Diss. Berlin 1930.
M. H. Abrams, *The Mirror and the Lamp. Romantic Theory and the Critical Tradition.* Oxford 1953.
A. J. Adams, *The Nature of Martial's Epigrams.* Ann Arbor 1975.
G. Adrian, *Quaestiones Statianae.* Diss. Würzburg 1893.
F. M. Ahl, *Lucan's De Incendio Urbis, Epistulae ex Campania and Nero's Ban.* TAPhA 102 (1971), 1-27.
F. M. Ahl, *Lucan. An Introduction.* Ithaca/London 1976.
M. von Albrecht, *Gleichnis und Innenwelt in Silius' Punica.* Hermes 91 (1963), 352-75.
H. Altevogt, *Labor improbus: eine Vergilstudie.* Münster 1975².
R. van Amerongen, *Drie scènes uit het voorspel tot Pharsalus. Een commentaar op Lucanus, Bellum Civile V 1-373.* Diss. Utrecht 1977.
W. B. Anderson, *Statius and the Date of the Culex.* CQ 10 (1916), 225-8.
J. André, *Étude sur les termes de couleur dans la langue latine.* Paris 1949.
J. André, *Lexique des termes de botanique en latin.* Paris 1956.
J. André, *Les noms d'oiseaux en latin.* Paris 1967.
H. Antony, *Humor in der augusteischen Dichtung. Lachen und Lächeln bei Horaz, Properz, Tibull und Vergil.* Hildesheim 1976.
Arbeitsgruppe für lateinische Metrik und Stilistik Tübingen, *Zur Elision anapästischer Wörter bei Vergil and Statius.* Glotta 50 (1972), 97-120.
J. C. Arens, *-Fer and -Ger. Their Extraordinary Preponderance in Roman Poetry.* Mnemosyne 3 (1950), 241-60.
R. Argenio, *La villa sorrentina di Pollio Felice (P. Papinii Statii Silvarum liber II 2).* RSC 18 (1970), 186-95.
G. Aricò, *Ricerche Staziane.* Palermo 1972.
J. H. d'Arms, *Romans on the Bay of Naples: a Social and Cultural Study of the Villas and their Owners from 150 B.C. to A.D. 400.* Cambridge (Mass.) 1970.
A. Artymowicz, *Der Wechsel von et und -que zu Beginn lateinischer dactylischer Verse von Ennius bis Corippus.* WS 31 (1909), 38-81.
R. G. Austin, *Quintiliani Institutionis oratoriae liber XII.* Oxford 1948.
R. G. Austin, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber secundus. With a Commentary.* Oxford 1964.
R. G. Austin, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber primus. With a Commentary.* Oxford 1971.
R. G. Austin, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber sextus. With a Commentary.* Oxford 1977.
B. Axelson, *Unpoetische Wörter. Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der lateinischen Dichtersprache.* Lund 1945.
J. Aymard, *Essai sur les chasses romaines des origines à la fin du siècle des Antonins (Cynegetica).* Paris 1951.
E. Baehrens, *Emendationum in Statii Silvas Particula I.* RhM 28 (1873), 250-63.
E. Baehrens, *Ire = sterben.* Glotta 5 (1914), 98.
C. Bailey, *Titi Lucreti Cari De Rerum Natura libri sex. Edited with Prolegomena, Critical Apparatus, Translation and Commentary.* Oxford 1947 (3 vols.).
D. R. S. Bailey, *Echoes of Propertius.* Mnemosyne 5 (1952), 307-33.
H. Bardon, *Notes sur la littérature impériale, II: Hypothèse sur l'Octavie.* Latomus 3 (1939), 253-8.

H. Bardon, *Les empereurs et les lettres latines d'Auguste à Hadrien.* Paris 1940.
H. Bardon, *L'aurore et le crépuscule (thèmes et clichés).* REL 24 (1946), 82-115.
H. Bardon, *La littérature latine inconnue. T. II: L'époque impériale.* Paris 1956.
H. Bardon, *Le goût à l'époque des Flaviens.* Latomus 21 (1962), 732-48.
G. J. M. Bartelink, *Etymologisering bij Vergilius.* Med. Kon. Ned. Akad. Wet. Afd. Lett. 28, 3 (1965), 147-261.
K. Barwick, *Martial und die zeitgenössische Rhetorik.* Ber. sächs. Akad. Wiss. Leipzig, phil.-hist. Klasse 104, 1. Berlin 1959.
*K. L. Baucom, *Four Consolationes of Statius.* Diss. Univ. of N. Carol. at Chapel Hill 1963.
J. Bayet, *Les origines de l'Hercule romain.* Paris 1926.
E. Bednara, *De sermone dactylicorum romanorum quaestiones.* ALL 14 (1906), 317-60.
A. Behotius, *Apophoretorum libri III in quibus auctores prisci passim illustrantur.* (Parisiis 1602).
L. Bek, *Antithesis. A Roman Attitude and its Changes as Reflected in the Concept of Architecture from Vitruvius to Pliny the Younger.* In: Ed. K. Ascani a.o., *Studia Romana in honorem P. Krarup septuagenarii* (Odense 1976), 154-66.
J. Beloch, *Campanien. Geschichte und Topographie des antiken Neapel und seiner Umgebung.* Breslau 1890[2] (Roma 1964).
J. Bérard, *La colonisation grecque de l'Italie méridionale et de la Sicile dans l'antiquité. L'histoire et la légende.* Paris 1957[2] (1941).
M. Bieber, *Roman Men in Greek Himation.* PAPhS 103 (1959), 356-417.
G. Bilanovitch, *Veterum vestigia vatum nei carmi dei preumanisti padovani.* IMU 1 (1958), 155-243.
J. Biletchi, *Die Ausdrucksmittel zur Bezeichnung des hohen Grades einer Eigenschaft bei Catull, Tibull, Properz, Vergil, Horaz, Ovid und Statius.* In: Ed. I. Hilberg & J. Jüthner, *Primitiae Czernovicienses* 1 (1909), 1-30.
J. H. Bishop, *The Debt of the Silvae to the Epyllia.* PP 6 (1951), 427-32.
J. H. Bishop, *The Silvae of Statius.* In: Ed. M. Kelly, *For Service to Classical Studies. Essays in Honour to Francis Letters* (Melbourne 1966), 15-30.
H. Blümner, *Technologie und Terminologie der Gewerbe und Künste der Griechen und Römer.* Leipzig/Berlin 1872-87. (Vol. 1: 1912[2] (1872), vol. 2: 1879, vol. 3: 1883, vol. 4: 1887).
H. Blümner, *Die Farbenbezeichnungen bei römischen Dichtern.* Berlin 1892.
H. Blümner, *Die römische Privataltertümer.* München 1911.
H. Blümner, *Die Schilderung des Sterbens in der römischen Dichtung.* NJA 43 (1919), 244-72.
F. Bömer, *Beiträge zum Verständnis der augusteischen Dichtersprache.* Gymnasium 64 (1957), 1-21.
Ed. F. Bömer, *P. Ovidius Naso. Die Fasten.* Hrsg., übers. und komm. von F. Bömer. Heidelberg 1957-8. (2 vols.).
Ed. F. Bömer, *P. Ovidius Naso. Metamorphosen.* Komm. von F. Bömer. Heidelberg 1969- . (Most recent volume: Book X-XI, 1980).
S. F. Bonner, *Education in Ancient Rome. From the Elder Cato to the Younger Pliny.* London 1977.
F. Borgeaud, *Recherches sur le dieu Pan.* Genève 1979.
J. P. Boucher, *Études sur Properce: problèmes d'inspiration et d'art.* Paris 1965.
C. Brakman, *Ad Statium.* Mnemosyne 57 (1929), 251-62.
W. Brandes, *Zu Statius III.* ZöG 36 (1885), 580-3.
R. Bray, *La préciosité et les précieux. De Thibault de Champagne à Jean Giraudoux.* Paris 1948.
D. F. Bright, *Elaborate Disarray. The Nature of Statius' Silvae.* Meisenheim a/Glan 1980.
C. O. Brink, *Horace on Poetry. The 'ars poetica'.* Cambridge 1971.
J. H. Brouwers, *Horatius en Propertius over epiek en lyriek.* Diss. Nijmegen 1967.
F. Brown, *Roman Architecture.* New York 1961.
M. Brożek, *De Statio Pindarico.* Eos 55 (1965), 338-40.
M. Brożek, *De Silvarum materia et forma a Statio suis consiliis accomodata.* Meander 21 (1966), 453-68. (In Polish. Summary in Latin).

M. Brożek, *Über die Auswahl der Versformen in Statius' "Silven"*. In: Ed. H. Gericke a.o., *Orbis Mediaevalis* (Festschrift A. Blaschka (Weimar 1970)), 45-56.
G. Brugnoli, *Cultura e propaganda nella restaurazione dell'età Flaviana.* AFFL 1 (1963-4), 5-36.
V. Buchheit, *Statius' Geburtstagsgedicht zu Ehren Lucans (Silv. 2, 7)*. Hermes 88 (1960), 231-49.
V. Buchheit, *Martials Beitrag zum Geburtstag Lucans als Zyklus.* Philologus 105 (1961), 90-6.
V. Buchheit, *Lucans Pharsalia und die Frage der Nichtvollendung.* RhM 104 (1961), 362-5.
W. W. Buckland, *The Roman Law of Slavery.* Cambridge 1908.
E. Burck, *Vom römischen Manierismus von der Dichtung der frühen römischen Kaiserzeit.* Darmstadt 1971.
*C. Buresch, *Consolationum a Graecis Romanisque Scriptarum Historia Critica.* Leipz. Stud. 9 (1871), 1-164.
A. Burger, *Deux adjectifs latins en "-vos".* REL 8 (1930), 222-30.
T. C. Burgess, *Epideictic Literature.* Chicago 1902.
P. Burmannus, *Sylloge epistolarum a viris illustribus scriptarum.* Coll. et. dig. per Pt. Burmannum. Leidae 1727 (5 vols.).
F. Cairns, *Propertius III 10 and Roman Birthdays.* Hermes 99 (1971), 149-55.
F. Cairns, *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry.* Edinburgh 1972.
H. Cancik, *Untersuchungen zur lyrischen Kunst des P. Papinius Statius.* Hildesheim 1965 (Spudasmata 13).
H. Cancik, *Spiegel der Erkenntnis. Zu Ovid Met. III 339-510.* AU 10 (1967), 42-53.
H. Cancik, *Eine epikureische Villa. Statius Silv. II 2 villa Surrentina.* AU 11 (1968), 62-75.
H. Cancik, *Amphitheater. Zum Problem der Gesamtinterpretation am Beispiel von Statius Silve II 5. Leo mansuetus.* AU 14 (1971), 66-81.
H. Cancik, *Römischer Religionsunterricht in apostolischer Zeit. Ein pastoralgeschichtlicher Versuch zu Statius, Silve V 3, 176-84.* In: Ed. H. Feld a.o., Festschrift K. H. Schelkle (1973), 181-96.
H. Cancik, *Die kleine Gattungen der römischen Dichtung in der Zeit des Prinzipats.* In: Ed. M. Fuhrmann, Neues Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft Bd. III: *Die römische Literatur* (Frankfurt a/M 1974), 261-89.
H. Cancik, *Tibur Vopisci. Statius, Silve I 3: Villa Tiburtina Manili Vopisci.* Boreas 1 (1978), 116-34.
H. Cancik, *Forschungsbericht zu Statius' Silven.* To appear in ANRW II *Principat. Sprache und Literatur.*
H. Cancik-Lindemaier, *Ein Mahl für Hercules. Ein Versuch zu Statius, Silve IV 6: Hercules Epitrapezios.* AU 14 (1971), 43-65.
G. P. Carratelli, *Sul culto delle Sirene nel Golfo di Napoli.* PP 25-27 (1952), 420-6.
I. B. Carter, *Epitheta Deorum quae apud poetas latinos leguntur.* Leipzig 1902.
C. Castillo Garcia, *Prosopographia Baetica.* Pamplona 1965. (2 vols.).
*J. J. Cavignan, *The Latin Consolatio as a Literary Type.* Webster Grove 1941 (*cf.* CB 19 (1942), 31).
J. P. Cèbe, *La caricature et la parodie dans le monde romain antique des origines jusqu'à Juvénal.* Paris 1966.
E. Cesareo, *Il carme natalizio nella poesia latina.* Palermo 1929.
L. Cesarini Martinelli, *Le Selve di Stazio nella critica testuale di Poliziano.* SIFC 47 (1975), 130-74.
J. P. Chausserie-Laprée, *L'expression narrative chez les historiens latins. Histoire d'un style.* Paris 1969.
M. Citroni, *M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammaton liber primus. Intr., testo, app. crit. e commento a cura di M. Citroni.* Firenze 1975.
W. K. Clement, *The Use of the Infinitive in Lucan, Valerius Flaccus, Statius and Juvenal.* TAPhA 33 (1902), LXXIV-LXXV.
Th. Cole, *Democritus and the Sources of Greek Anthropology.* Ann Arbor 1967.
A. M. Colini, *Storia e topografia del Celio.* Città del Vaticano 1944.
C. Collard, *Jeremiah Markland.* PCPhS 202 (1976), 1-15.

R. E. Colton, *Juvenal on Recitations*. CB 42 (1966), 81-5.
R. E. Colton, *"Parrot Poems" in Ovid and Statius*. CB 43 (1967), 71-8.
Concordance, See Deferrari.
F. O. Copley, *Exclusus Amator. A Study in Latin Love Poetry*. Madison, Wisc./Oxford 1956.
J. J. Cornelissen, *Ad Statii Silvas*. Mnemosyne 5 (1877), 277-94.
E. Courtney, *On the Silvae of Statius*. BICS 13 (1966), 94-100.
E. Courtney, *Emendations of Statius' Silvae*. BICS 15 (1968), 51-8.
E. Courtney, *Further Remarks on the Silvae of Statius*. BICS 18 (1971), 95-7.
J. Cousin, *Nature et mission du poète dans la poésie latine XV = Valérius Flaccus, Silius Italicus, Stace*. RCC 40 (1939), 375-84.
R. Crahay, *La vision poétique d'Ovide et l'esthétique baroque*. In: *Atti del Convegno Internazionale Ovidiano Sulmone maggio 1958* (Roma 1959), T. 1, 91-110.
F. Crusius & H. Rubenbauer, *Römische Metrik*. München 1955².
F. Cumont, *Afterlife in Roman Paganism*. New Haven 1922.
F. Cumont, *Recherches sur le symbolisme funéraire des Romains*. Paris 1942.
G. G. Curcio, *Studio su P. Papinio Stazio*. Catania 1893.
E. R. Curtius, *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter*. Bern 1969⁷.
H.-J. van Dam, *Critical Remarks on Statius Silvae II*. In: Ed. C. Deroux, *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* (Coll. Latomus vol. 168, Bruxelles 1980), 378-406.
P. Dams, *Dichtungskritik bei nachaugusteischen Dichtern*. Diss. Marburg 1970.
P. H. Damsté, *De verbi mutandi usu apud P. Papinium Statium*. In: *Sertum Nabericum* (Leiden 1908), 77-84.
P. H. Damsté, *Spicilegium in Silvis*. Mnemosyne 51 (1923), 135-78.
Ch. Daremberg, Edm. Saglio, *Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines d'après les textes et les monuments*. Paris 1877-1919 (5 vols.).
R. J. Deferrari & C. Eagan, *A Concordance to Statius*. Catholic University of America 1943 (1966).
B. Deipser, *De Publio Papinio Statio Virgilii et Ovidii imitatore*. Diss. Strasbourg 1881.
F. Delarue, *Stace et les "modernes"*. RPh 48 (1974), 274-301.
F. Delarue, *Stace et ses contemporains*. Latomus 33 (1974), 536-48.
*A. A. Diaz, *Variaciones sobre un tema*. REC 2 (1946), 143-57. (The theme of *Silv.* II 4: Catullus 3, Ovid *Amores* II 6, Statius *Silvae* II 4, Martialis I 109).
U. Dierauer, *Tier und Mensch im Denken der Antike*. Amsterdam 1977.
P. Dierschke, *De fide Prisciani in versibus Vergilii, Lucani, Statii, Iuvenalis examinata*. Diss. Greifswald 1913.
A. Dihle, *The Conception of India in Hellenistic and Roman Literature*. PCPhS 190 (1964), 15-23.
O. A. W. Dilke, *The Metrical Treatment of Proper Names in Statius*. CR 43 (1949), 50-1.
E. Doblhofer, *Rutilius Claudius Namatianus, De reditu suo sive iter gallicum*, Hrsg., eingel. und erkl. von E. Doblhofer. Heidelberg 1972.
H. Drerup, *Zum Ausstattungsluxus in der römischen Architektur. Ein formgeschichtlicher Versuch*. Münster 1957.
H. Drerup, *Die römische Villa*. Marburger Winckelmann Programm 1959, 1-17.
H. Drerup, *Architektur als Symbol. Zur zeitgenössischen Bewertung der römischen Architektur*. Gymnasium 73 (1966), 181-96.
F. Drexel, *Die Tierhetzen*. In: *SG* II¹⁰ 77-92.
G. E. Duckworth, *Vergil and Classical Hexameter Poetry. A Study in Metrical Variety*. Ann Arbor 1969.
A. M. Duff, *Freedmen in the Early Roman Empire*. Oxford 1928.
T. S. Duncan, *The Influence of Art on Description in the Poetry of Statius*. Diss. Baltimore 1914.
A. J. Dunston, *What Politian saw*. BICS 14 (1967), 96-101.
Ed. M. Durry, *Lucain*. Genève 1970 (Entr. Fond. Hardt).
E. Dutoit, *Le thème de l'adynaton dans la poésie latine*. Paris 1936.
E. Eissfeldt, *Zu den Vorbildern des Statius*. Philologus 63 (1904), 378-424.
R. Ellis, *On Two Passages of Statius' Silvae*. JPh 5 (1874), 262-5.

R. Ellis, *On Some Passages of Statius' Silvae.* JPh 13 (1885), 88-97.
R. Ellis, *Adversaria.* JPh 15 (1886), 1-11.
R. Ellis, *An Oxford Ms. of Statius' Silvae.* JPh 20 (1892), 17-24.
R. Ellis, *A Theory of the Culex.* CR 10 (1896), 177-83.
R. Ellis, *Lafaye's Notes on Statius' Silvae I and Klotz, Curae Statianae.* CR 11 (1897), 43-7.
R. Ellis, *Adversaria V.* JPh 28 (1903), 16-23.
R. Ellis, *Adversaria VII.* JPh 31 (1910), 153-61.
H. Emonds, *Zweite Auflage im Altertum.* Leipzig 1941.
A. Engelmann, *De Statii Silvarum codicibus.* Leipz. Stud. 20 (1902), 1-144.
A. Engelmann, *Ueber die Handschriften der Silvae des Statius.* Hermes 38 (1903), 285-91.
P. J. Enk, *De aesthetische waardering der Latijnse letterkunde in de 19e en 20e eeuw.* Acad. Rede Groningen 1930.
N. E. Enkvist, *Linguistic Stylistics.* Den Haag/Paris 1973.
A. Ernout & E. Thomas, *Syntaxe latine.* Paris 1953².
A. Ernout & A. Meillet, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine. Histoire des mots.* Paris 1959⁴ (vol. I), 1960⁴ (vol. II).
J. Esteve Forriol, *Die Trauer- und Trostgedichte in der römischen Literatur, untersucht nach ihrer Topik und ihrem Motivschatz.* Diss. München 1962.
G. Ettig, *Acheruntica sive descensuum apud veteres enarratio.* Leipz. Stud. 13 (1891), 251-410.
E. C. Evans, *Roman Descriptions of Personal Appearance in History and Biography.* HSPh 46 (1935), 43-84.
E. Eyben, *Die Einteilung des menschlichen Lebens im römischen Altertum.* RhM 116 (1973), 150-90.
E. Eyben, *De jonge Romein. Volgens de literaire bronnen der periode ca. 200 v. Chr. tot ca. 500 n. Chr.* Brussel 1977.
J. Ferguson, *The Religions of the Roman Empire.* London/New York 1970.
A. J. Festugière, *La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste. II. Le dieu cosmique.* Paris 1949.
A. J. Festugière, *Personal Religion among the Greeks.* Berkeley/Los Angeles 1954.
G. B. A. Fletcher, *Imitationes vel loci similes in poetis latinis.* Mnemosyne 1 (1934), 192-213.
G. B. A. Fletcher, *Some Certain or Possible Examples of Literary Reminiscences in Tacitus.* CR 59 (1945), 45-50.
G. B. A. Fletcher, *The Suffix -met in Post-Virgilian Poetry.* Hermes 94 (1966), 254-6.
R. C. Flickinger & C. Murley, *The Accusative of Exclamation: Seneca to Juvenal.* CPh 18 (1923), 162-9.
P. Flobert, *Recherches sur les verbes déponents latins.* Paris 1973.
E. Flores, *Interpretazioni staziane I.* RAAN 39 (1964), 3-21.
H. W. Fortgens, *Publius Papinius Statius, de latijnse dichter van het kinderleven.* Hermeneus 31 (1959), 52-9.
W. W. Fowler, *The Roman Festivals of the Period of the Republic. An Introduction to the Study of the Religion of the Romans.* London 1899.
Ed. Fraenkel, *Das Geschlecht von dies.* Glotta 8 (1917), 24-68.
Ed. Fraenkel, *Lucan als Mittler des antiken Pathos.* 1927. (A.o. in: Ed. W. Rutz, *Lucan* (Darmstadt 1970), 15-49).
Ed. Fraenkel, *Horace.* Oxford 1957.
J. M. Frécaut, *L'esprit et l'humour chez Ovide.* Grenoble 1972.
W. Frentz, *Mythologisches in Vergils Georgika.* Meisenheim a/Glan 1976.
H. Frère, *Stace Silv. IV praef., 5 ss.* In: *Mélanges P. Thomas. Recueil de mémoires concernant la philologie classique* (Bruges 1930), 300-11.
B. Friederich, *Zu Statius' Silven.* RhM 38 (1883), 471-4.
L. Friedländer, *D. Junii Juvenalis Saturarum libri V, mit erklärenden Anmerkungen.* Leipzig 1895 (Darmstadt 1967).
L. Friedländer, *Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms. In der Zeit von August bis zum Ausgang der Antonine.* Bearb. von G. Wissowa: I⁹ Leipzig 1919, II¹⁰ *ibid.* 1922, III¹⁰ *ibid.* 1923, IV⁹⁻¹⁰ *ibid.* 1921.
P. Friedländer, *Johannes von Gaza und Paulus Silentarius. Kunstbeschreibungen justinianischer Zeit.* Leipzig/Berlin 1912.

P. Friedländer, *Statius an den Schlaf.* A 8 (1932), 215-28.
H. Friedrich, *Ueber die Silvae des Statius (inbesondere V, 4 Somnus) und die Frage des literarischen Manierismus.* In: Ed. H. Meier a.o., *Wort und Text (Festschrift Fritz Schalk)* (Frankfurt a/M 1963), 34-57.
H. Friedrich, *Manierismus.* In: Ed. W. H. Friedrich a.o., Fischer's Lexicon: *Literatur* 2, 2 (Frankfurt a/M 1965), 353-8.
H. Fugier, *Recherches sur l'expression du sacré.* Paris 1963.
G. Funaioli, *Recitationes.* *2RE* I (1914), 435-46.
J. Gagé, *Romulus-Augustus.* MEFR 1930, 138-81.
D. Gagliardi, *Sul De Incendio Urbis.* RFIC 96 (1968), 435-8.
G. K. Galinsky, *The Herakles Theme. The Adaptations of the Hero in Literature from Homer to the Twentieth Century.* Oxford 1977.
H. W. Garrod, *Asconius, Statius, Poggio, Politian and Pithou.* CR 27 (1913), 88-90.
H. W. Garrod, *Statius, Poggio and Politian.* CR 27 (1913), 265-6.
A. Garzya, *Stace et Ménandre.* AC 25 (1965), 412-6.
V. Gaymann, *Kunstarchäologische Studien zu P. Papinius Statius.* Diss. Würzburg 1898.
W. Geissler, *Ad descriptionum historiam symbola.* Diss. Leipzig 1916.
M. I. Gerhardt, *Old Men of the Sea.* Amsterdam 1967.
G. Gevartius, *Electorum libri tres.* Parisiis 1619.
G. Giri, *Su alcuni punti della biografia di Stazio.* RFIC 35 (1907), 433-60.
G. Goetz, *De Statii Silvis emendandis.* Index lect. Jena 1884.
F. Gonfroy, *Un fait de civilisation méconnue: l'homosexualité masculine à Rome.* Thèse III.e cycle (dactyl.) Poitiers 1972.
G. P. Goold, *Observationes in Codicem Matritensem M. 31: De Silii et Statii Silvarum scripta memoria.* RhM 99 (1956), 9-17.
G. P. Goold, *Catullus 3. 16.* Phoenix 23 (1969), 186-203.
A. J. Gossage, *Papinius, the Father of Statius.* Romanitas 6-7 (1965), 171-9.
A. J. Gossage, *Virgil and the Flavian Epic.* In: Ed. D. R. Dudley, *Virgil* (London 1969), 67-93.
A. J. Gossage, *Statius.* In: Ed. D. R. Dudley, *Neronians and Flavians. Silver Latin I.* (London 1972), 184-236.
M. Gothein, *Der Titel von Statius' Silvae.* RhM 63 (1908), 475-6.
M. Grant, *Gladiators.* London 1967.
L. Grasberger, *Zu Statius Silvae.* Jahrb. f. class. Philol. 115 (1877), 419-22; 769-76.
N. A. Greenberg, *Epanastrophe in Latin Poetry.* RELO 2 (1972), 1-17.
R. C. Gregg, *Consolation Philosophy. Greek and Christian Paideia in Basil and the Two Gregories.* Philadelphia 1975.
E. Griessmair, *Das Motiv der mors immatura in den griechischen metrischen Grabinschriften.* Innsbruck 1966.
P. Grimal, *Les jardins romains.* Paris 1969².
E. Griset, *Il problema della 'Silva' V, 3 di Stazio.* RSC 10 (1962), 128-32.
I. F. Gronovius, *In P. Papinii Statii Silvarum libros V Diatribe ad Th. Graswinckelium.* Hagae Comitis 1637.
O. Grosz, *De metonymiis sermonis Latini a deorum nominibus petitis.* Diss. Phil. Halenses 19 (1911), 297-410.
S. Gsell, *Essai sur le règne de l'empereur Domitien.* Paris 1894.
A. Gudeman, *P. Cornelii Taciti Dialogus de oratoribus. Mit Prolegomena, Text und adnotatio critica, exegetischem und kritischem Kommentar, Bibliographie und index nominum et rerum.* Leipzig/Berlin 1914².
A.-M. Guillemin, *L'imitation dans les littératures antiques.* REL 2 (1924), 35-57.
A.-M. Guillemin, *Sociétés de gens de lettres à l'époque de Pline le Jeune.* REL 5 (1927), 261-92.
A.-M. Guillemin, *Les descriptions de villas de Pline le Jeune.* BAGB 19 (1928), 6-15.
A.-M. Guillemin, *Pline et la vie littéraire de son temps.* Paris 1929.
Ed. P. Guiraud & P. Kuentz, *La stylistique.* Paris 1970.
J. F. Gummere, *The Neuter Plurals in Vergil.* Diss. Univ. of Pennsylvania 1934.
W. Härtel, *Studia Statiana.* Leipzig 1900.

R. Häussler, *Das historische Epos von Lucan bis Silius und seine Theorie.* Heidelberg 1978.
H. Hagendahl, *Latin Fathers and the Classics.* Stockholm 1958.
L. Håkanson, *Statius' Silvae. Critical and Exegetical Remarks, with Some Notes on the Thebaid.* Lund 1969.
L. Håkanson, *Statius' Thebaid. Critical and Exegetical Remarks.* Lund 1973.
P. Hamon, *Qu'est-ce qu'une description?* Poétique 12 (1972), 465-85.
*O. Hanak, *De Papinii Statii Silvarum sermonis colore rhetorico.* Diss. Wien 1912. (Dactyl., *cf.* Wiener Diss.-Verzeichnis 2, n° 1707).
F. Hand, *Tursellinus seu de particulis latinis commentarii.* Lipsiae 1829-45. (4 vols.).
W. R. Hardie, *Notes on the Silvae of Statius.* CR 18 (1904), 156-8.
R. Hartenberger, *De o finali apud poetas latinos ab Ennio usque ad Iuvenalem.* Diss. Bonn 1911.
J. J. Hartman, *Review of edition Postgate & Davies.* Museum 12 (1905), 407-14.
M. Haupt, *Beiträge zur Berichtigung der Gedichte des P. Papinius Statius. Aus Richard Bentleys und Johann Schraders Aufzeichnungen.* Opuscula III (1876), 126-36.
M. Haupt, *Opuscula.* Ed. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. Lipsiae 1875-6. (3 vols.). (*De traiectione particulae et*: I 115-26).
L. Havet, *Notes critiques sur les poètes latins. III.* REA 17 (1915), 101-10; 177-82; 267-70.
G. Hegyi, *Horace et Stace.* ACD 10-11 (1974-5), 95-9.
V. Hehn, *Kulturpflanzen und Haustiere in ihrem Übergang aus Asien nach Griechenland und Italien, sowie in das übrige Europa. Historisch-linguistische Skizzen.* Berlin 1883[4].
Nic. Heinsius, *Adversariorum libri IV.* Ed. P. Burmannus iun. Harlingae 1742.
R. Heinze, *Vom Geist des Römertums. Ausgewählte Aufsätze.* Hrsg. von E. Burck, Darmstadt 1960[3].
R. Helm, *Papinius.* In: *RE* XVIII (1949), 984-1000.
N. I. Herescu, *Catulle 3: un écho des nénies dans la littérature.* REL 25 (1947), 74-6.
N. I. Herescu, *La poésie latine. Étude des structures phoniques.* Paris 1960.
G. Herrlinger, *Totenklage um Tiere in der antiken Dichtung.* Stuttgart 1930.
L. Herrmann, *L'âge d'argent doré.* Paris 1951.
L. Herrmann, *Stace interpolateur de Virgile et de Columelle.* In: *Studi in onore di G. Funaioli* (Roma 1955), 128-32.
P. Herrmann, *Das Testament des Epikrates und andere neue Inschriften aus dem Museum von Manisa.* Wien 1969.
H. Heuvel, *De inimicitiarum quae inter Martialem et Statium fuisse dicuntur indiciis.* Mnemosyne 4 (1936-7), 299-330.
O. Hey, *Enallage adiectivi.* ALL 14 (1906), 105-12.
T. Heydenreich, *Tadel und Lob der Seefahrt.* Heidelberg 1970.
G. Highet, *The Speeches in Vergil's Aeneid.* Princeton 1972.
I. Hilberg, *Zur Biographie des Statius.* WS 24 (1902), 514-8.
M. Hirschfeld, *Die Sexualität des Mannes und des Weibes.* Berlin 1914. (Handbuch der ges. Sexualwiss. n° 3).
G. M. Hirst, *Statius, Silvae I. VI. 7, 8.* CR 38 (1923), 149-50.
R. Hirzel, *Der Name. Ein Beitrag zu seiner Geschichte im Altertum und besonders bei den Griechen.* Leipzig 1918 (Abh. sächs. Ges. Wiss., phil.-hist. Kl. 36, 2).
G. R. Hocke, *Die Welt als Labyrinth.* 1957 (Rohwolts deutsche Enzyklopädie 50-1).
G. R. Hocke, *Manierismus in der Literatur.* 1959 (Rohwolts deutsche Enzyklopädie 82-3).
J. B. Hofmann, *Lateinische Umgangssprache.* Heidelberg 1951[3].
L. Adams Holland, *Ianus and the Bridge.* Rome 1961.
A. E. Housman, *The Silvae of Statius.* CR 20 (1906), 37-47.
A. E. Housman, *Greek Nouns in Latin Poetry.* JPh 31 (1910), 236-66.
A. E. Housman, *Ovidiana.* CQ 10 (1916), 130-50.
A. E. Housman, *Notes on the Thebaid of Statius.* CQ 27 (1933), 1-16; 65-73.
J. Hubaux & M. Leroy, *Le mythe de phénix dans les littératures grecque et latine.* Liège 1939.
U. Hübner, *Hypallage in Lucan's Pharsalia.* Hermes 100 (1972), 577-600.
U. Hübner, *Studien zur Pointentechnik in Lucans Pharsalia.* Hermes 103 (1975), 200-11.
A. Hus, *Docere et les mots de la famille de docere. Étude de sémantique latine.* Paris 1965.

A. Imhof, *De Silvarum Statianarum condicione critica.* Progr. Halle 1859.
T. Janson, *Latin Prose Prefaces. Studies in Literary Conventions.* Stockholm 1964. (Studia Latina Stockholmensia 13).
G. Jennison, *Animals for Show and Pleasure in Ancient Rome.* Manchester 1937.
H. Th. Johann, *Trauer und Trost. Eine quellen- und strukturanalytische Untersuchung der philosophischen Trostschriften über den Tod.* München 1968.
W. H. S. Jones, *Unconscious Iterations.* PCPhS 181 (1950-1), 19-22.
A. Kambylis, *Die Dichterweihe und ihre Symbolik. Untersuchungen zu Hesiodos, Kallimachos, Properz und Ennius.* Heidelberg 1965.
H. T. Karsten, *Spicilegium Statianum.* Mnemosyne 27 (1899), 341-77.
M. Kaser, *Das römische Privatrecht.* Teil I München 1971², Teil II München 1975².
R. Kassel, *Untersuchungen zur griechischen und römischen Konsolationsliteratur.* München 1958 (Zetemata n° 18).
G. Kennedy, *The Present State of the Study of Ancient Rhetoric.* CPh 70 (1975), 278-82.
E. J. Kenney, *Doctus Lucretius.* Mnemosyne 23 (1970), 366-92.
A. Ker, *Notes on Statius.* CQ 47 (1953), 1-10; 175-82.
P. Kerckhoff, *Duae quaestiones Papinianae.* Diss. Berlin 1884.
W. Kese, *Untersuchungen zu Epikedion und Consolatio in der römischen Dichtung (von Catull bis Statius).* Diss. Göttingen 1950. (Dactyl.).
W. Kierdorf, *Laudatio funebris. Interpretationen und Untersuchungen zur Entwicklung der römischen Leichenrede.* Meisenheim am Glan 1980.
A. Kiessling & R. Heinze, *Q. Horatius Flaccus, Oden und Epoden. Erkl. von A. Kiessling, bes. von R. Heinze.* Dublin/Zürich 1968¹³.
Kleine Pauly: Ed. W. Sontheimer & K. Ziegler, *Der kleine Pauly. Lexikon der Antike. Auf der Grundlage von Pauly's Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft.* München 1964-75 (5 vols.).
A. Klotz, *Ad Stati Achilleida symbola critica.* Philologus 61 (1902), 292-310.
A. Klotz, *Zur Ueberlieferung der Silvae des Statius.* Hermes 38 (1903), 468-80.
A. Klotz, *Review of edition Phillimore.* BPhW 26 (1906), 457-63.
A. Klotz, *Review of edition Postgate & Davies.* ALL 14 (1906), 297-9.
A. Klotz, *Klassizismus und Archaismus. Stilistisches zu Statius.* ALL 15 (1908), 401-17.
A. Klotz, *Der Titel von Statius' Silvae.* RhM 64 (1909), 473-4.
A. Klotz, *Die manus velox Poggios.* BPhW 30 (1910), 925-7.
H. A. Koch, *Coniectaneorum in poetas latinos pars altera: In Statium.* Progr. Gymn. Frankfurt a/O. 1865, 4-17.
H. Köstlin, *Besserungen und Erläuterungen zu P. Papinius Statius.* Philologus 35 (1876), 493-533; 713-4.
H. Köstlin, *Zu Statius.* Philologus 36 (1877), 176-81.
H. Köstlin, *Besserungen und Erläuterungen zu P. Papinius Statius. II.* Philologus 37 (1877), 276-92.
H. Köstlin, *Lateinische Epiker. II. Zu Valerius Flaccus.* Philologus 39 (1880), 33-68.
J. Ph. Krebs & J. H. Schmalz, *Antibarbarus der lateinischen Sprache, nebst einem kurzen Abriss der Geschichte der lateinischen Sprache und Vorbemerkungen über reine Latinität.* Basel 1886⁵.
W. Kroll, *Knabenliebe. RE* XI¹ (1921), 897-906.
W. Kroll, *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur.* Stuttgart 1924 (Darmstadt 1973).
W. Kroll, *Rhetorik. RE Suppl.* 7 (1940), 1040-1138.
G. Krumbholz, *Der Erzählungsstil in der Thebais des Statius I-II.* Glotta 34 (1955), 93-138; 231-60.
R. Kühner & F. Blass, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache.* Band I. Hannover 1890.
R. Kühner, C. Stegmann, A. Thierfelder, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache.* Leverkusen 1955³ (2 vols.).
H. Kunisch, *Zum Problem des Manierismus. Einführung.* In: Literaturwissenschaftl. Jahrb. 2 (1961), 173-7.
*B. Kytzler, *Statius-Studien. Beiträge zum Verständnis der Thebais.* Diss. Berlin 1955. (Dactyl.).

B. Kytzler, *Beobachtungen zum Prooemium der Thebais.* Hermes 88 (1960), 331-54.
B. Kytzler, *Gleichnisgruppen in der Thebais des Statius.* WS 75 (1962), 141-60.
B. Kytzler, *Manierismus in der klassischen Antike?* In: *Colloquia Germanica I* (Bern 1967), 2-25.
F. Lämmli, *Homo Faber. Triumph, Schuld, Verhängnis.* Basel 1968.
G. Landgraf, *Der Dativus commodi und der Dativus finalis mit ihren Abarten.* ALL 8 (1893), 39-76.
H. Landwehr, *Studien über das antike Buchwesen.* ALL 6 (1889), 219-53.
H. Landwehr, *Studien über die antike Buchterminologie.* ALL 6 (1889), 419-33.
H.-J. Lange, *Aemulatio Veterum sive de optimo genere dicendi. Die Entstehung des Barockstils im XVI. Jahrhundert durch eine Geschmacksverschiebung in Richtung des manieristischen Typs.* Bern/Frankfurt a/M. 1974.
K. Latte, *Römische Religionsgeschichte.* München 1967².
R. Lattimore, *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs.* Urbana 1942 (Illinois Studies in Language and Literature n° 28).
H. Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik. Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft.* München 1960.
E. B. Lease, *Zur Konstruktion von licet.* ALL 11 (1900), 9-26.
W. D. Lebek, *Verba prisca. Die Anfänge des Archaisierens in der lateinischen Beredsamkeit und Geschichtsschreibung.* Göttingen 1970.
A. D. Leeman, *Orationis Ratio. The Stylistic Theories and Practices of the Roman Orators, Historians and Philosophers.* Amsterdam 1963. (2 vols.).
E. Lefèvre, *Die Bedeutung des Paradoxen in der römischen Literatur der frühen Kaiserzeit.* Poetica 3 (1970), 59-82.
L. Legras, *Étude sur la Thébaide de Stace.* Paris 1905.
L. Legras, *Les dernières années de Stace.* REA 9 (1907), 338-49 & REA 10 (1908), 34-70.
F. J. Lelièvre, *The Basis of Ancient Parody.* G&R 1 (1954), 66-81.
F. Leo, *De Senecae tragoediis observationes criticae.* Berlin 1878.
F. Leo, *De Stati Silvis Commentatio.* Index lect. Göttingen 1892-3.
E. Lepore, *Per la storia economico-sociale di Neapolis.* PP 25-27 (1952), 300-32.
A. Lesky, *A History of Greek Literature.* English transl. London 1966.
M. Leumann, *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre.* München 1977² (1926-8).
M. Leumann, J. B. Hofmann, A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Grammatik.* Teil II München 1965 (1972).
G. Levi della Vida & G. Pasquali, *De duobus Statii Silvarum locis controversis.* SIFC 15 (1907), 123-8.
C. Liedloff, *De tempestatis, necyomanteae, inferorum descriptionibus.* Diss. Leipzig 1884.
B. Lier, *Topica carminum sepulcralium latinorum.* Philologus 62 (1903), 445-77; 563-603. Philologus 63 (1904), 54-65.
S. Lilja, *The Treatment of Odours in the Poetry of Antiquity.* Helsinki 1972.
W. Link, *De vocis 'sanctus' usu pagano quaestiones selectae.* Diss. Königsberg 1910.
H. C. Lipscomb, *Aspects of the Speech in the Later Roman Epic.* Diss. Baltimore 1909.
J. F. Lockwood, *On Editing the Silvae of Statius.* PLCS 1 (1947-52), 4-5.
E. Löfstedt, *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der lateinischen Sprache.* Uppsala 1911.
E. Löfstedt, *Syntactica.* Teil I Lund 1942², Teil II Lund 1956².
E. Löfstedt, *Vermischte Studien zur lateinischen Sprachkunde und Syntax.* Lund 1936.
F. Lohr, *De infinitivi apud Statium et Iuvenalem usu.* Diss. Marburg 1876.
H. Lohrisch, *De Papinii Statii Silvarum poeta studiis rhetoricis.* Diss. Halle 1905.
G. Lotito, *In margine alla nuova edizione Teubneriana delle Selve di Stazio.* A&R 19 (1974), 26-48.
G. Luck, *P. Ovidius Naso: Tristia. Hrsg., übers. und erkl. von G. Luck.* Heidelberg 1967-72 (2 vols.).
G. Luehr, *De P. Papinio Statio in Silvis priorum poetarum imitatore.* Diss. Königsberg 1880.
R. Lunderstedt, *De Synecdochae apud P. Papinium Statium usu.* Diss. Weida 1913.
V. Lundstroem, *Quaestiones Papinianae.* Diss. Uppsala 1893.

R. O. A. M. Lyne, *The Dating of the Ciris.* CQ 21 (1971), 233-53.
A. Lytton Sells, *Animal Poetry in French and English Literature and the Greek Tradition.* Indiana Univ. Press 1975.
P. Maas, *Studien zum poetischen Plural bei den Römern.* ALL 12 (1902), 479-550.
M. J. McGann, *The Authenticity of Lucan, Fr. 12 (Morel).* CQ 51 (1957), 126-8.
M. J. McGann, *Lucan's De Incendio Urbis, Prose or Verse?* RFIC 99 (1971), 63-5.
M. J. McGann, *Lucan's De Incendio Urbis: The Evidence of Statius and Vacca.* TAPhA 105 (1975), 213-7.
R. MacMullen, *Enemies of the Roman Order.* Oxford 1966.
H. MacNaghten, *On Some Passages of the Silvae of Statius.* JPh 19 (1891), 129-37.
I. N. Madvig, *Adversaria critica.* Hauniae 1873.
A. Marastoni, *Nonnulla de P. Papini Stati Silvarum editionibus.* Aevum 30 (1956), 354-62.
A. Marastoni, *Per una nuova interpretazione di Stazio poeta delle Selve. I.* Aevum 31 (1957), 393-414.
A. Marastoni, *Per una nuova interpretazione di Stazio poeta delle Selve. II.* Aevum 32 (1958), 1-37.
A. Marastoni, *Note alle Selve di Stazio.* RIL 93 (1959), 437-52.
A. Marastoni, *Der Dichter Statius.* Altertum 15 (1969), 220-37.
J. Marouzeau, *Traité de stylistique latine.* Paris 1935 (1970).
J. Marouzeau, *L'ordre des mots dans la phrase latine III.* Paris 1949.
J. Marquardt, *Das Privatleben der Römer.* Leipzig 1886². (2 vols.). (bes. von A. Mau).
H.-I. Marrou, Μουσικὸς 'Ανήρ. *Étude sur les scènes de la vie intellectuelle figurant sur les monuments funéraires romains.* Grenoble 1938 (Roma 1964).
D. Martin, *Similarities between the Silvae of Statius and the Epigrams of Martial.* CJ 34 (1939), 461-70.
A. Mau, *Bestattung. RE* 3 (1899), 331-59.
A. Mau, *Catasta. RE* 3 (1899), 1785-6.
A. Mau, *Delicati. RE* 4 (1901), 2435-8.
C. Maubert, *L'enfer de Silius Italicus.* RPh 54 (1928), 140-60; 216-40.
J. Maurin, *Remarques sur la notion de puer à l'époque classique.* BAGB 1975, 221-30.
R. Mayer, *Two Notes on Latin Poets.* PCPhS 202 (1976), 56-9.
K. Meister, *Lateinisch-griechische Eigennamen,* Leipzig/Berlin 1916.
H. Mende, *De animarum in poesi epica et dramatica ascensu.* Diss. Breslau 1913.
E. Mensching, *Lukans Schriftenverzeichnis bei Statius (Silv. II 7).* Hermes 97 (1969), 252-5.
A. Merlin, *L'Aventin dans l'antiquité.* Paris 1909.
W. A. Merrill, *Notes on the Silvae of Statius. Book II.* UCP 5 (1918-1920), 69-134; 155-82.
K. Meuli, *Gesammelte Schriften.* Ed. Th. Gelzer. Basel/Stuttgart 1975. (2 vols.).
W. Michler, *De P. Papinio Statio M. Annaei Lucani imitatore.* Diss. Breslau 1914.
J. I. Miller, *The Spice Trade of the Roman Empire 29 B.C. to A.D. 641.* London 1969.
P. Mingazzini & F. Pfister, *Forma Italiae. Regio I vol. 2 Surrentum.* Firenze 1946.
H. N. & A. L. Moldenke, *Plants of the Bible.* Waltham (Mass.) 1952.
Th. Mommsen, *Grabschrift aus Rom.* Hermes 2 (1867), 156-9.
Th. Mommsen, *Inschrift des Pollius Felix.* Hermes 18 (1883), 158-60.
*C. H. Moore, *The Epicedia of Statius.* Boston 1913.
C. H. Moore, *Prophecy in the Ancient Epic.* HSPh 22 (1921), 99-175.
*C. H. Moore, *The Epicedia of Statius.* Kittredge Anniversary Papers (New York 1967), 127-37.
P. Morillon, *Sentire, Sensus, Sententia. Recherche sur le vocabulaire de la vie intellectuelle, affective et physiologique en Latin.* Thèse Paris 1973 (Lille 1974).
A. Motte, *Prairies et jardins de la Grèce antique. De la religion à la philosophie.* Bruxelles 1973.
A. L. Motto, *Guide to the Thought of Lucius Annaeus Seneca.* Amsterdam 1970.
J. H. Mozley, *Statius as an Imitator of Vergil and Ovid.* CW 17 (1933), 33-8.
H. Mueller, *Studia Statiana.* Diss. Rostock 1884.
O. Mueller, *Quaestiones Statianae.* Progr. Berlin 1861.
O. Mueller, *Zu den Gedichten des P. Papinius Statius.* RhM 18 (1863), 189-201.
O. Mueller, *Electa Statiana.* Progr. Berlin 1892.

Ch. Muller, *Initiation à la statistique linguistique.* Paris 1973.
E. Nachmanson, *Der griechische Buchtitel.* Göteborg 1941.
P. G. van der Nat, *Poeta Maximus.* Leiden 1976.
E. Nauke, *Observationes criticae et grammaticae in Statium.* Breslau 1863.
F. Neue & C. Wagener, *Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache.* Leipzig 1892-1905³. (4 vols.).
S. T. Newmyer, *The Silvae of Statius: Structure and Theme.* Leiden 1979.
J. Niemirska-Pliszczyńska, *De elocutione pliniana in epistularum libris novem conspicua quaestiones selectae.* Lublin 1955.
D. M. Nisard, *Études de mœurs et de critique sur les poètes latins de la décadence.* 3 Tômes. Bruxelles 1834.
R. G. M. Nisbet, *Felicitas at Surrentum (Statius Silvae II 2).* JRS 68 (1978), 1-11.
R. G. M. Nisbet & M. Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace Odes Book I.* Oxford 1970.
R. G. M. Nisbet & M. Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace Odes Book II.* Oxford 1978.
H. Nohl, *Quaestiones Statianae.* Diss. Berlin 1871.
E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos. Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede.* Stuttgart 1912 (1971).
E. Norden, *P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis Buch VI.* Leipzig/Berlin 1912² (1976).
E. Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa. Vom VI. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance.* Leipzig/Berlin 1915³ (1971).
R. B. Onians, *The Origins of European Thought about the Body, the Mind, the Soul, the World, Time and Fate. New Interpretations of Greek, Roman and Kindred Evidence, also of Some Basic Jewish and Christian Beliefs.* Cambridge 1951.
A. Önnerfors, *Väterporträts in der römischen Poesie, unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von Horaz, Statius und Ausonius.* Stockholm 1974.
P. J. Österberg, *De structura verborum cum praepositionibus compositorum, quae exstant apud C. Val. Flaccum, P. Pap. Statium, M. Val. Martialem.* Diss. Uppsala 1893.
A. E. Orentzel, *Juvenal and Statius.* CB 52 (1976), 61-2.
A. Otto, *Zur Kritik von Statius' Silvae.* RhM 42 (1887), 362-73; 531-46.
A. Otto, *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer.* Leipzig 1890 (Hildesheim/New York 1971). *Nachträge zu A. Otto Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer.* Eingel. und mit einem Register, hrsg. von R. Häussler. Hildesheim 1968.
M. Pastore Stocchi, *Sulle curae statianae del Poliziano,* AIV 125 (1966-67), 39-74.
*Z. Pavlovskis, *The influence of Statius upon Latin Literature before the Tenth Century.* Diss. Cornell Univ. 1962. (Summary in DA 23 (1963), 3362).
Z. Pavlovskis, *From Statius to Ennodius. A Brief History of Prose Prefaces to Poems.* RIL 101 (1967), 535-67.
Z. Pavlovskis, *Man in an Artificial Landscape.* Leiden 1973.
A. S. Pease, *Publi Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber quartus.* Cambridge (Mass.) 1935. (Darmstadt 1967).
A. Pellicer, *Natura. Étude sémantique et historique du mot latin.* Paris 1966.
N. J. Perella, *The Kiss Sacred and Profane. An Interpretative History of Kiss Symbolism and Related Religio-Erotic Themes.* Los Angeles 1969.
P. Perrochat, *L'infinitif de narration en Latin.* Paris 1932.
H. Peter, *Der Brief in der römischen Literatur. Literargeschichtliche Untersuchungen und Zusammenfassungen.* Leipzig 1901.
W. J. T. Peters, *Landscape in Romano-Campanian Mural Painting.* Assen 1963.
R. M. Peterson, *The Cults of Campania.* Roma 1919.
W. Peterson, *Quintiliani Institutionis Oratoriae liber X. Intr., text, notes.* Oxford 1903².
G. Pfohl, *Elemente der griechischen Epigraphik.* Darmstadt 1968².
Ed. G. Pfohl, *Epigramm. Zur Geschichte einer inschriftlichen und literarischen Gattung.* Darmstadt 1969.
J. S. Phillimore, *Statius and the Date of the Culex.* CQ 11 (1917), 106.
R. Pichon, *De sermone amatorio apud Latinos elegiarum scriptores.* Paris 1902.
D. Pikhaus, *Levensbeschouwing en milieu in de Latijnse metrische inscripties. Een onderzoek naar de invloed van plaats, tijd, sociale herkomst en affectief klimaat.* Brussel 1978.

M. Piot, *Hercule chez les poètes latins du Ier siècle ap. J.C.* REL 43 (1965), 342-58.
S. B. Platner & T. Ashby, *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome.* London 1929.
H. W. Pleket, *Epigraphica vol. 2. Texts on the Social History of the Greek World.* Leiden 1969.
F. Plessis, *La poésie latine.* Paris 1909.
V. Pöschl, *Der Katalog der Bäume in Ovids Metamorphosen.* In: Ed. H. R. Jauss & D. Schaller, *Medium Aevum Vivum* (Festschrift W. Bulst. Heidelberg 1960), 13-21.
A. Poliziano, *Oratio super Fabio Quintiliano et Statii Silvis.* 1498. In: Ed. E. Garin, *Prosatori latini del Quattrocento* (Milano/Napoli 1952), 870-84.
A. Poliziano, *Commento inedito alle Selve di Stazio.* Ed. L. Cesarini Martinelli. Firenze 1978.
L. Polster, *Zu Statius Silven.* Jahrb. f. class. Philol. 107 (1873), 774-5.
L. Polster, *Quaestionum Statianarum particula I.* Progr. Gymn. Wongrowitz 1878 n° 133.
L. Polster, *Quaestiones Tullianae. Accedit Quaestionum Statianarum part. II.* Progr. Ostrowo 1879, 16-20.
L. Polster, *Quaestiones Statianae III.* Progr. Ostrowo 1884.
L. Polster, *Quaestiones Statianae IV.* Progr. Inowrocław 1890.
J. P. Postgate, *Engelmann on the Mss. of Statius' Silvae.* CR 16 (1902), 421-3.
J. P. Postgate, *The Manuscript Problem in the Silvae of Statius.* CR 17 (1903), 344-51.
J. P. Postgate, *Ad Silvas Statiana silvula.* Philologus 64 (1905), 116-36.
J. P. Postgate, *On Three Passages of the Silvae of Statius.* CR 20 (1906), 306-7.
J. P. Postgate, *Phillimore's Silvae of Statius.* CR 20 (1906), 317-24.
J. P. Postgate, *The Manuscript Problem in the Silvae of Statius.* CR 27 (1913), 53-4.
J. P. Postgate, *On Trajection of Words or Hyperbaton.* CR 30 (1916), 142-6.
A. Priess, *Usum adverbii quatenus fugerint poetae latini quidam dactylici.* Diss. Marburg 1909.
K. Quinn, *Latin Explorations.* London 1963.
K. Quinn, *Catullus, the poems. Edited with Introduction, Revised Text and Commentary.* London 1970.
L. Radermacher, *Hippolytus und Thekla.* Wien 1916.
E. Raimondi, *Per la nozione di manierismo letterario.* (*Il problema del manierismo nelle letterature europee.*). In: *Manierismo, Barocco, Rococò: Concetti e Termini* (Accad. Naz. dei Lincei. Roma 1962), 57-79.
E. S. Ramage, *Urbanitas. Ancient Sophistication and Refinement.* Oklahoma 1973.
A. Ramminger, *Motivgeschichtliche Studien zu Catulls Basiagedichten.* Diss. Tübingen 1937.
H.-D. Reeker, *Die Landschaft in der "Aeneis".* Hildesheim 1971 (Spudasmata n° 27).
M. D. Reeve, *Statius' Silvae in the Fifteenth Century.* CQ 27 (1977), 202-25.
S. Reinach, *Juvénal et Stace.* RPh 31 (1907), 45-50.
R. Reitzenstein, *Epigramm. RE* VI (1909), 71-111.
R. Reitzenstein, *Zur Sprache der lateinischen Erotik.* Sitz. Ber. Heidelberg 1912.
*F. Riegler, *Historische Ereignisse und Personen bei Martial und Statius.* Diss. Wien 1967. (Dactyl.).
R. Rieks, *Homo, humanus, humanitas. Zur Humanität in der lateinischen Literatur des ersten nachchristlichen Jahrhunderts.* München 1967.
H. Riikonen, *The Attitude of Roman Poets and Orators to the Countryside as a Place for Creative Work.* Arctos 10 (1976), 75-85.
E. Risch, *Zur altlateinischen Gebetssprache.* ILing 5 (1979), 43-53.
J. M. Rist, *Epicurus. An Introduction.* Cambridge 1972.
Z. Ritoók, *Dichterweihen.* ACD 6 (1970), 17-25.
S. Rizzo, *Il lessico filologico degli umanisti.* Roma 1973.
L. Robert, *Ulpia Heraclea.* In: *Hellenica 3* (Paris 1946), 5-31.
L. Robert, *Recherches épigraphiques VII: Décret de la Confédération Lycienne à Corinthe.* REA 62 (1960), 324-42.
L. Robert, *Hellenica 13.* Paris 1965.
E. Rohde, *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer.* Leipzig 1900².
F. Rohde, *De interiectionum usu apud aetatis argenteae scriptores Latinos.* Diss. Königsberg 1911.

Ed. W. H. Roscher, *Ausführliches Lexicon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie.* Leipzig 1884-1937.
W. H. Roscher, *Die enneadischen und hebdomadischen Fristen und Wochen.* ASG 21 (1903), n° 4.
W. H. Roscher, *Die Sieben- und Neunzahl im Kultus und Mythus der Griechen.* ASG 24 (1906), n° 1.
W. H. Roscher, *Die Hebdomadenlehre der griechischen Philosophen und Ärzte.* ASG 24 (1906), n° 6.
H. J. Rose, *A Handbook of Greek Mythology.* London 1958[6].
K. F. C. Rose, *Problems in the Chronology of Lucan's Career.* TAPhA 97 (1966), 379-96.
A. Rostagni, *Stat. Silv. II 2, 121-6.* RFIC 1933, 81.
A. Rostagni, *La cultura letteraria di Napoli antica nelle sue fasi culminanti.* PP 25-27 (1952), 344-57.
M. Rostovtzeff, *Pompeianische Landschaften und römische Villen.* JDAI 19 (1904), 103-26.
M. Rostovtzeff, *Die hellenistisch-römische Architekturlandschaft.* Röm. Mitt. 26 (1911), 1-186.
M. Rothstein, *Die Elegien des Sextus Propertius, erklärt von M. Rothstein.* Berlin 1898.
M. Rothstein, *Ad Statii Silvas observationes criticae.* Festschrift J. Vahlen (Berlin 1900), 497-522.
Io. Ruppert, *Quaestiones ad historiam dedicationis librorum pertinentes.* Diss. Leipzig 1911.
A. Rutgers van der Loeff, *Het sterven van de rode bloem.* Hermeneus 24 (1952), 41-3; 62-5; 89-93.
W. Rutz, *Lukanbibliographie.* Lustrum 9 (1964), 243-334 & Lustrum 10 (1965), 246-56.
Ed. W. Rutz, *Lucan.* Darmstadt 1970 (WdF n° 235).
W. Rutz, *Lukan.* To appear in: ANRW: *Principat. Sprache und Literatur.*
E. de St. Denis, *Essai sur le rire et le sourire des Latins.* Paris 1965.
C. E. Sandström, *Studia critica in Papinium Statium.* Uppsala 1878.
U. Sangmeister, *Die Ankündigung direkter Rede im 'nationalen' Epos der Römer.* Meisenheim a/Glan 1978.
F. Sauter, *Die römische Kaiserkult bei Martial und Statius.* Stuttgart/Berlin 1934.
A. Sauvage, *Étude des thèmes animaliers dans la poésie latine. Le cheval. Les oiseaux.* Bruxelles 1975.
R. Sayce, *The Definition of the Term 'Style'.* Actes du IIIe Congrès de l'Assoc. int. de litt. comp. 21-26 VIII 1961 Utrecht ('s-Gravenhage 1962), 156-67.
H. Schadel, *Thanatos. Studien zu den Todesvorstellungen der antiken Philosophie und Medizin.* Pattensen 1974.
M. Schamberger, *De P. Papinio Statio verborum novatore.* Diss. philol. Halenses 17 (1907), n[os] 2-4.
O. Schantz, *De incerti poetae consolatione ad Liviam deque carminum consolatoriorum apud Graecos et Romanos historia.* Diss. Marburg 1889.
M. Schanz & C. Hosius, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur bis zum Gesetzgebungswerk des Kaisers Justinian.* München 1935[4] (vol. 2).
A. Scherer, *Handbuch der lateinischen Syntax.* Heidelberg 1975.
W. Schetter, *Untersuchungen zur epischen Kunst des Statius.* Wiesbaden 1960.
A. Schilling, *Lucubrationum Statianarum pars prior.* Progr. Rixdorf 1905.
R. Schilling, *L'Hercule romain et la réforme religieuse d'Auguste.* RPh 16 (1942), 3, 31-57.
*J. Schilp, *Die politische Ideen und Probleme der domitianischen Zeit, gesehen aus den Werken der zeitgenössischen Dichter Martial, Statius, Silius Italicus.* Diss. Marburg 1947.
W. Schink, *De Romanorum plurali poetico.* Diss. Jena 1911.
W. Schmidt, *Geburtstag im Altertum.* Giessen 1908.
W. Schmidt, *Genethlios Hemera.* In: *RE* VII (1912), 1135-49.
Wi. Schmidt, *De ultimis morientium verbis.* Diss. Marburg 1914.
G. Schönbeck, *Locus amoenus von Homer bis Horaz.* Diss. Heidelberg 1962.
O. Schremp, *Prophezeiung und Rückschau in Lucans Bellum Civile.* Zürich 1964.
P. H. Schrijvers, *Horror ac divina voluptas. Études sur la poétique et la poésie de Lucrèce.* Amsterdam 1970.

P. H. Schrijvers, *Interpreteren van een Horatiaanse Ode* (*I 10*). Lampas 6 (1973), 126-52.
P. H. Schrijvers, *Comment terminer une ode?* Mnemosyne 26 (1973), 140-59.
P. H. Schrijvers, *La pensée de Lucrèce sur l'origine du langage* (*DRN V 1019-1090*). Mnemosyne 27 (1974), 337-64.
P. H. Schrijvers, *O Tragoedia Tu Labor Aeternus. Étude sur l'élégie III, 1 des Amores d'Ovide.* In: Ed. J. M. Bremer a.o., *Miscellanea tragica in honorem J. C. Kamerbeek* (Amsterdam 1976), 405-24.
P. H. Schrijvers, *Het lied van Iopas. Verbindingen van literatuur en natuurwetenschap in het Latijn.* Groningen 1978.
P. H. Schrijvers, *Op receptie bij Horatius.* Lampas 14 (1981), 17-29.
H. Schubert, *De P. Papinii Statii artis grammaticae et metricae rationes.* Diss. Greifswald 1913.
W. Schulze, *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen.* Berlin 1904.
*E. Schwartz, *Coniectanea.* Progr. Rostock 1889.
K. Scott, *Statius' Adulation of Domitian.* AJPh 54 (1933), 247-59.
K. Scott, *The Imperial Cult under the Flavians.* Stuttgart/Berlin 1936.
J. Shearman, *Mannerism.* London 1967. (Penguin).
A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Letters of Pliny. A Historical and Social Commentary.* Oxford 1966.
F. Skutsch, *Ad Statii Silvas symbolae.* Jahrb. f. class. Philol. 39 (1893), 169-84.
F. Skutsch & F. Vollmer, *Ad Statii Silvas symbolae II.* Jahrb. f. class. Philol. 39 (1893), 825-43.
F. Skutsch, *Consolatio ad Liviam. RE* 4 (1901), 933-47.
D. A. Slater, *Corruptions of set in Latin Mss.* CR 18 (1904), 302.
D. A. Slater, *Conjectures.* CR 23 (1909), 248-9; 190.
D. A. Slater, *Notes on Statius.* CR 26 (1912), 255-8.
D. A. Slater, *Statius, Poggio and Politian.* CR 32 (1918), 166-7.
W. J. Slater, *Pueri Turba Minuta.* BICS 21 (1974), 133-40.
K. F. Smith, *The Influence of Art upon Certain Traditional Passages in the Epic Poetry of Statius.* AJA 7 (1903), 93.
K. F. Smith, *The Elegies of Albius Tibullus. The Corpus Tibullianum Edited with Introduction and Notes on Books I, II and IV 2-14.* 1913 (Darmstadt 1971).
E. C. H. Smits, *Faunus.* Leiden 1946.
W. R. Smyth, *Statius, Silvae II. 1 130.* CR 56 (1942), 112-3.
W. R. Smyth, *Statius, Silvae I. II 183.* CR 62 (1948), 14.
R. Soffel, *Die Regeln Menanders für die Leichenrede in ihrer Tradition dargestellt. Hrsg. und Komm.* Meisenheim a/Glan 1974.
J. Soubiran, *L'élision dans la poésie latine.* Paris 1966.
F. Speranza, *L'inizio e la pubblicazione delle Selve di P. Papinio Stazio.* AFLN 1 (1951), 29-33.
F. Speranza, *Neologismi nelle Selve di Publio Papinio Stazio.* AAP 6 (1956), 35-56.
F. Speranza, *Note sulla cronologia di P. Papinio Stazio.* AFLN 7 (1957), 107-16.
Th. Stangl, *Divinare oportet, non legere. Zur Würdigung jeder Poggio-hs.* BPhW 33 (1913), 1180-4.
R. B. Steele, *The Endings -ere and -erunt in Dactylic Hexameter.* AJA 32 (1911), 328-33.
R. B. Steele, *Interrelation of the Latin Poets under Domitian.* CPh 25 (1930), 328-42.
H. Strehlein, *Die Totenklage des Vaters um den Sohn in der sophokleischen und euripideischen Tragödie.* Diss. München 1958.
F. Streich, *De exemplis atque comparationibus quae exstant apud Senecam, Lucanum, Val. Flaccum, Statium, Sil. Italicum.* Diss. Breslau 1913.
W. Suerbaum, *Untersuchungen zur Selbstdarstellung älterer römischer Dichter: Livius Andronicus, Naevius, Ennius.* Hildesheim 1968.
J. Svennung, *Untersuchungen zu Palladius und zur lateinischen Fach- und Volkssprache.* Uppsala 1935.
H. Szelest, *Marcjalis i współczesne środowisko literackie.* Meander 18 (1963), 139-50. (With Latin Summary).
H. Szelest, *Die Originalität der sogenannten beschreibenden Silven des Statius.* Eos 56 (1966), 186-97.

H. Szelest, *"Sylwy" Stacjusza.* Archiwum filologiczne 28 (1971). (123 pp., Summary in French).
H. Szelest, *Rolle und Bedeutung des P. Papinius Statius als des Verfassers der Silvae in der römischen Dichtung.* Eos 60 (1972), 87-101.
H. Szelest, *Mythologie und ihre Rolle in den Silvae des Statius.* Eos 60 (1972), 309-17.
L. L. Tels-de Jong, *Sur quelques divinités romaines de la naissance et de la prophétie.* Delft 1959.
P. Thielscher, *De Statii Silvarum Silii Manilii scripta memoria.* Philologus 66 (1907), 85-134.
P. Thielscher, *Zu den Maniliushandschriften.* RhM 42 (1907), 485-6.
P. Thielscher, *Zur Maniliusüberlieferung.* Philologus 82 (1927), 167-80.
P. Thielscher, *Ist "M. Manilii Astronomicon Libri V" richtig?* Hermes 84 (1956), 353-72.
P. Thielscher, *Remarks on the Manuscript Tradition of Statius' Silvae.* CQ 7 (1957), 47-52.
E. Thomas, *Some Reminiscences of Ovid in Latin Literature.* In: *Atti del Convegno Internazionale Ovidiano Sulmone maggio 1958* (Roma 1959), T. 1, 145-71.
E. Thomas, *A Comparative Analysis of Ovid Amores II 6 and III 9.* Latomus 24 (1965), 599-609.
P. Thomas, *Le poète Stace.* Gand 1904.
D'A. W. Thompson, *A Glossary of Greek Birds.* London 1936.
S. Thompson, *Motif-Index of Folk-Literature. A Classification of Narrative Elements in Folktales, Ballads, Myths, Mediaeval Romances, Exempla, Fabliaux, Jest-Books and Local Legends.* København 1955-58. (6 vols.).
C. Thulin, *Fulgur, Fulmen und Wortfamilie.* ALL 14 (1906), 369-91; 509-14.
B. M. Tidman, *On the Foundation of the Actian Games.* CQ 44 (1950), 123-5.
F. A. Todd, *De Musis in carminibus poetarum Romanorum commemoratis.* Jena 1903.
R. Törnebladh, *Ad Statium Adnotationes.* In: *Commentationes Philologae in honorem Joh. Paulson* (Göteborg 1905), 41-54.
J. M. C. Toynbee, *Death and Burial in the Roman World.* London 1971.
J. M. C. Toynbee, *Animals in Roman Life and Art.* London 1973.
A. Traglia, *Appunti per una nuova edizione delle "Selve" di Stazio.* BPEC 8 (1960), 29-45.
A. Traglia, *De P. Papinio Statio Silvarum poeta.* Latinitas 15 (1967), 171-9.
A. Traglia, *Problemi di critica Staziana: "Le Selve".* C&S 40 (1971), 58-64.
A. Traglia, *Problemi di critica Staziana: "L'Achilleide".* C&S 43 (1972), 67-74.
R. Y. Tyrrell & L. C. Purser, *The Correspondence of M. Tullius Cicero Arranged According to its Chronological Order with a Revision of the Text, a Commentary and Introductory Essays on the Life of Cicero and the Style of his Letters.* Vol. I London/Dublin 1885².
H. Usener, *Epicurea.* Leipzig 1887.
A. Vassileiou, *Dulcem Gallionem. (Note sur Stace Silves II 7, 32).* RPh 46 (1972), 40-2.
P. Venini, *Stazio: poeta doctus?* RIL 103 (1969), 461-76.
R. Verdière, *L'auteur du Panegyricus Messalae tibullien.* Latomus 13 (1954), 56-64.
A.-M. Vérilhac, ΠΑΙΔΕΣ 'ΑΩΡΟΙ. *Poésie funéraire. T. 1 Textes.* Athēnai 1978.
H. S. Versnel, *Triumphus. An Inquiry into the Origin, Development and Meaning of the Roman Triumph.* Leiden 1970.
H. S. Versnel, *A Parody on Hymns in Martial V 24 and Some Trinitarian Problems.* Mnemosyne 27 (1974), 365-405.
H. S. Versnel, *Destruction,* **Devotio** *and Despair in a Situation of Anomy: the Mourning for Germanicus in Triple Perspective.* In: *Perennitas. Studi in onore di Angelo Brelich* (Roma 1980), 541-618.
H. S. Versnel, *Self-sacrifice, Compensation and the Anonymous Gods.* In: *Le sacrifice dans l'antiquité* (Entr. Fond. Hardt 27 (1981)), 135-94.
D. W. T. C. Vessey, *Thoughts on the Epyllion.* CJ 66 (1970), 38-43.
D. W. T. C. Vessey, *Lucan, Statius and the Baroque Epic.* CW 63 (1970), 232-4.
D. W. T. C. Vessey, *Varia Statiana.* CB 46 (1970), 49-55; 64.
D. W. T. C. Vessey, *Aspects of Statius' Epithalamion.* Mnemosyne 25 (1972), 172-87.
D. W. T. C. Vessey, *Statius and the Thebaid.* Cambridge 1973.
D. W. T. C. Vessey, *Sidonius, Polla and Two Poets.* CB 50 (1973-4), 37-9.
P. Veyne, *La famille et l'amour sous le haut-empire romain.* Annales 33 (1978), 35-63.
S. Viarre, *L'image et la pensée dans les Métamorphoses d'Ovide.* Paris 1964.

F. Vollmer, *Laudationum funebrium Romanorum historia et reliquiarum editio.* Jahrb. f. class. Philol. Suppl. 18 (1892), 447-527.
F. Vollmer, *De funere publico Romanorum.* Jahrb. f. class. Philol. Suppl. 19 (1893), 321-61.
F. Vollmer, *Textkritisches zu Statius.* RhM 51 (1896), 27-44.
F. Vollmer, *Zur Ueberlieferung von Statius' Silvae.* Hermes 38 (1903), 134-9.
F. Vollmer, *Laudatio funebris. RE* 12 (1925), 992-4.
G. Vorberg, *Glossarium eroticum.* Hanau 1965.
A. J. B. Wace, *The Greeks and Romans as Archaeologists.* BSAA 38 (1949), 21-35. (Repr. in: ed. R. F. Herzer, *Man's Discovery of his Past: Literary Landmarks in Archaeology* (Englewood Cliffs 1962), 152-65).
C. Wachsmuth, *Zu den Handschriften der Silven des Statius.* Leipz. Stud. class. Philol. 20 (1902), 203-14.
H. Wagenvoort, *Imperium. Studiën over het "mana"-begrip in zede en taal der Romeinen.* Amsterdam 1941.
A. Walde & J. B. Hofmann, *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch.* Heidelberg 1938³ (vol. I), 1954³ (vol. II).
W. Waller, *Excursus criticus in P. Papinii Statii Silvas.* Diss. Breslau 1885.
C. Wanke, *Seneca Lucan Corneille. Studien zum Manierismus der römischen Kaiserzeit und der französischen Klassik.* Heidelberg 1964.
A. Wasserstein, *The Manuscript Tradition of Statius' Silvae.* CQ 47 (1953), 69-78.
A. Wasserstein, *Politian's Commentary on the Silvae of Statius.* Scriptorium 10 (1956), 83-9.
A. Wasserstein, *The Manuscript Tradition of Statius' Silvae.* CQ 8 (1958), 111-2.
J. H. Waszink, *Q. Sept. Flor. Tertulliani De Anima. Ed. with Intr. and Comm. by J. H. Waszink.* Amsterdam 1947.
A. Watson, *The Law of Persons in the Later Roman Republic.* Oxford 1967.
T. B. L. Webster, *Hellenistic Art.* London 1967.
P. G. van Wees, *Poëtische geografie in Vergilius' Aeneis.* Diss. Utrecht 1970.
O. Weinreich, *Antike Heilungswunder. Untersuchungen zum Wunderglauben der Griechen und Römer.* Giessen 1909 (RVV VIII 1).
O. Weinreich, *Studien zu Martial.* Stuttgart 1928.
R. E. H. Westendorp Boerma, *P. Vergilii Maronis libellus qui inscribitur Catalepton, conspectu librorum, prolegomenis, notis criticis, commentario exegetico instructus.* Groningen 1949.
R. Westman, *Das Futurpartizip als Ausdrucksmittel bei Seneca.* Helsinki 1961.
C. Weyman, *Zu Properz, Ovid und Statius.* BBG 1899, 578-85.
*P. White, *Aspects of Nonimperial Patronage in the Works of Martial and Statius.* Diss. Harvard 1972. (*Cf.* HSPh 87 (1973), 258-60).
P. White, *The Presentation and Dedication of the Silvae and the Epigrams.* JRS 64 (1974), 40-61.
P. White, *Positions for Poets in Early Imperial Rome.* In: Ed. B. K. Gold, *Literary and Artistic Patronage in Ancient Rome* (Austin 1982), 50-66.
L. P. Wilkinson, *Vergil's Georgics.* Oxford 1969.
G. Williams, *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry.* Oxford 1968.
R. D. Williams, *The Scansion of deest in Statius.* PCA 48 (1951), 32.
R. D. Williams, *The Local Ablative in Statius.* CQ 1 (1951), 143-6.
R. D. Williams, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber quintus. With a Commentary.* Oxford 1960.
J. A. Willis, *The Silvae of Statius and their Editors.* Phoenix 20 (1966), 305-24.
W. Wimmel, *Kallimachos in Rom. Die Nachfolge seines apologetischen Dichtens in der Augusteerzeit.* Wiesbaden 1960.
K. Winnefeld, *Tusci und Laurentinum des jüngeren Plinius.* JDAI 6 (1890), 201-17.
Th. Winter, *De ellipsi verbi esse apud Catullum, Vergilium, Ovidium, Statium, Iuvenalem obvia capita duo.* Diss. Marburg 1907.
G. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer.* München 1912.
G. Wissowa, *Chronologie der Gedichte des Martial und Statius.* In: L. Friedländer & G. Wissowa, *Sittengeschichte* IV 290-6.
E. Wistrand, *Vitruvius-studier.* Göteborg 1933.

Ed. Wölfflin, *Was heißt bald...bald?*. ALL 2 (1885), 233-54.
Ed. Wölfflin, *Die Entwicklung des Infinitivus historicus*. ALL 10 (1898), 177-86.
E. Wunderlich, *Die Bedeutung der roten Farbe im Kultus der Griechen und Römer, erläutert mit Berücksichtigung entsprechender Bräuche bei anderen Völkern*. Giessen 1925 (RVV XX (1925-6), 1).
J. Ziehen, *Drei Zeitbestimmungen bei Statius*. Neue Jahrb. Philol. 153 (1896), 131-2.
J. Ziehen, *Studien zu den Silven des Statius*. Ber. d. freien deutschen Hochstiftes zu Frankfurt a/Main 12 (1896), 207-16.
J. Ziehen, *Epenzitate bei Statius*. Hermes 31 (1896), 313-7.
J. Ziehen, *Review of edition Vollmer*. GGA 1904, 642-58.
A. Zingerle, *Zu späteren lateinischen Dichtern. Beiträge zur Geschichte der römischen Poesie*. Innsbruck 1873 (Heft I), 1879 (Heft II).

INDEX

References are to pages

ab 236-7, 387-8, 434
ablative 220, 246, 248, 256, 314, 326, 387, 417, 500
accendere 395
accepto ferre 60, 62
accusative 182, 272, 321, 331, 350, 437, 494
Achilleid 2, 116-7, 413-4
see Silvae
Achilles 116-7, 409-14, 424, 432, 448, 476, 490-1, 493, accusative in *-em* 410-1
Acir 427-8
Actian games 197-9
adlocutio 482
address 75-7, 79, 92, 102-3, 182-3, 238, 287, 327, 342, 344, 361, 368, 372, 392, 399, 426, 437, 442
aderrare 264
adesse 183, 501
adjective 130-1, 136, 139, 215, 266, 298, 362, 408; descriptive 81, 136, 294, 398; with inf. 153, 332; with sup. 314
adolere 364-5
adsciscere 115, 272
adynation 79, 217, 469
Aeacus 179, 185
Aeolius 137-8
Agaue (mime) 15 n. 31
agger 156
agricultural/horti- vocabulary 115, 120, 122, 130-1, 227, 254, 302, 315, 333
aition 5, 213, 281, 283, 286, 297, 299, 308, 311, 316, 321, 327
Akrokorinth 215, 456-7
Alban games 1, 14 n. 15, n. 16, 15 n. 30, 198
Alexander 341, 491-2
Ambracius 197
amicitia 2, 280
amoenitas 214
amoenus, see locus amoenus
amomum 150, 363-4, 440
Amphion 231-2
Amyclaeus 123, 250, 485
anacoluthon 7, 422
anaphora 8, 116, 136, 178, 222, 237, 377-8, 399
anguifer 159
angustus 132, 351, 492
animals, poetry on death of 4-5, 282, 336-8, 368-70, 385; in circus 369-72, 374-7; taming 227, 374-5; language 343; funeral 341, 403-4; *see* birds, lion, parrot, underworld
animare 235, 321-2
ante 412
Antipater of Sidon 337, 369
-anus 9, 20 n. 80, 486
Anyte 336, 338, 341
Aonius 354, 462
Apelles 234-5
apertus 299
apo koinou 9, 88, 101, 106, 132, 153, 155, 296-7, 308, 318, 387, 437, 440, 489, 506
Apollo, *see* Phoebus
apostrophe 102, 120, 135-6, 140, 151-2, 183, 349, 385, 392, 490; see address, names
Appia 200
Aratus 66
Arcas 458; *see* Mercurius
arcere 90
archaisms 9, 297-8, 458, 505
arduus 167, 229, 289, 491, 494
Arethusa 204, 284-5, 289, 296, 309
Argiletum 295-6
Argonauts 409, 476
Ariadne 408
Arion 228, 231-2, 263-4
art 188, 216, 233-4, 239, 478; *see* nature
arx 212, 270
ascendere 164
asper 242
Assyrius 148, 363-4
ast 179
asyndeton 101, 116, 234, 317, 361, 402, 457, 489
ataraxia 210, 238, 276
Atedius Melior 54-5, 58-60, 62, 68-9, 72-5, 78-83, 89-92, 100-3, 108-10, 112-4, 120-1, 131-3, 140, 146-8, 151-5, 161-2, 166-73, 182-3, 186, 207, 258, 277, 281, 285-7, 289, 291, 298-9, 311, 316, 319, 327, 329-34, 336, 339-40, 343, 345, 349, 351, 357-8, 362-3, 365, 368, 375, 385, 390-2, 451
Athamas 137-9
Augustalia 1, 13 n. 6, n. 12, 197-8

augustus 132, 351, 492
aurea mediocritas 277, 330-1
Ausonius 52, 69 n. 15, 71, 162, 187, 225, 256-7, 289, 313, 411, 432, 453
Auster 361
aut 462
Autumnus 129, 177-8
Aventinus 295-6, 303
avoidance of common words 8, 20 n. 77, 343, 363; *see esse, ire, habere*

Baccheis 215
Bacchus 118-9, 138, 157, 196, 208, 211, 214-6, 253-4, 311, 458-61, 463, 468, 502; *see* Bromius, Euhan, Lyaeus
Bassaris 459
beard 102, 412, 419-20
beauty 91-2, 103, 124, 135, 200, 359-60, 390-1, 404, 412-7, 421, 489; after death 144, 435
Bellum germanicum 14 n. 15
bellus 418
-bilis 136
bilis 9, 20 n. 80, 104-5
birds, talking 340-2, 346-8, 352-8, 361-3, 370, 377; human details 339-40, 343-4, 349, 352, 357-8, 361; for eating 341, 361; poems on death of 336-40; funeral of 341, 358, 402
birthday 281-3, 327-8, 334, 352, 450-2, 456, 460-4, 472, 495, 501, 505
Bistonius 356
Blaesus 69, 161-2, 166-73, 207, 327, 334-5
blandus 10, 20 n. 84, 97, 116, 173, 264, 329, 417
Blotch, *see* Nero
Bromius 196, 313
Bruma 129, 177

cacophony 99, 104, 422
cacumen 326
Cacus 295-6
cadere 256
Caelicus 297-8
caeruleus 206-7
Calliope 452, 454, 464, 470-4, 480-1, 488-90, 493-5, 505
candidus 100, 247, 249, 311; *candor* 91, 94
canorus 347
cantus 78, 409, 475
Capitoline games 1, 14 n. 16, 15 n. 30, 125
cardo 380, 431
carpere 137-8, 345
cassis 417-9
castration 415
catalogue 176, 233-5, 239, 241, 245-7, 251-2, 352, 377, 394, 426-7, 452, 457, 477, 486-7, 490
catasta 110-1
catenatus 123
Cato 407, 483, 499
Catullus 282, 337-40, 343, 346, 357, 406, 453, 489
causes of death 176
cavere 410
Cecropius 424
cedat 79, 233, 348, 486
celsus 277
census 9, 20 n. 80, 278, 426, 489
central panel 74, 281, 456, 473
Cerberus 162, 185
cervus 303, 370, 374-5, 403-4
ceu 20 n. 80, 289-90, 386
Chalcidicus 251
Charon 160, 162-3, 185, 447
chelys 79, 262, 264
Cicero 54, 56-7, 65 n. 6, 175, 212, 277, 394, 399
cinnamon 150, 440
circum undique 381
Claudia, wife of St. 1, 13 n. 14, 454
Claudianus 71, 168, 382, 421 n. 5, 428
clausula 56-7
cludere 61
colour 6, 91-2, 133, 247, 249-50, 339, 360-1, 438, 460-1
Columella 57, 469
comere 118, 332
comfortin 63-8, 74-5, 81-2, 89, 140, 143, 160, 182-3, 358, 362, 369, 384-5, 389, 402, 443, 452; *see consolatio*
comparative for positive 461, 496, 502
comparisons, metaphors, similes 6, 9, 75, 79-80, 109, 122-4, 133, 135, 137, 146, 210, 227-8, 263, 265, 269-70, 274, 315, 348, 367, 374, 382-3, 386, 390, 397, 402-3, 413, 417, 420-1, 423-4, 426, 430-1, 449, 468, 473-6, 490, 492, 502; epics 370, 372-3
compounds 20 n. 78, 76, 118, 136, 246, 264-5, 288, 344
conclamare 396
Concordance, errors in 78 n. 20, 92 n. 24, 102 n. 25, 117 n. 28, 119 n. 29, 123 n. 30, 131 n. 33, 159 n. 39, 163 n. 40, 170 n. 42, 181 n. 46, 206 n. 11, 220 n. 18, 225 n. 19, 236 n. 22, 237 n. 23, 242 n. 25, 307 n. 14, 320 n. 19, 346 n. 11, 347 n. 12, 350 n. 15, 351 n. 16, 352 n. 17, 375 n. 8, 382 n. 11, 386 n. 15, 446 n. 10, 457 n. 9, 494 n. 26
Concordia 257-8, 279

concrete details 6, 91, 117-9, 137, 140, 153, 157, 232, 254-5, 257, 295, 344, 348, 372, 380, 383, 398, 405, 408, 411, 418, 435, 478, 493-4, 502; see visual attitude
consolari 140, 143-4
consolatio, poetry 4-5, 18 n. 54, n. 55, 57, 60, 63-7, 74, 100, 129, 161, 265, 328, 337, 339, 368-9, 384-5, 390-1, 450-2, 473, 478, 482; *see epicedion*; *Haupttopoi* in 18 n. 51, 66-7, 89, 338-40, 369, 390; *see laudatio*, *lamentatio*, *descriptiones*, *consolatio proper*; praise in 63-5, 91-2; *see laudatio*; symbolic function of 67, 327, 485; parody 337-40, 344-5, 351, 359; *consolatio* proper 66-7, 135, 160, 338-9, 358, 363, 369, 384-5, 390, 425, 442-3; *topoi* in *cons.* proper 85, 135, 160-2, 166, 171, 173-4, 182-3, 185-6, 358-9, 366, 384-5, 442-6, 448-9, 452, 495, 501; adversative particle in *cons.* proper 144, 160, 349, 363, 384, 443, 495; prose *consolatio* 63-4, 66, 160, 443; *see* funeral speech, *laudatio funebris*
consortia 89
conubium 301
Corinna 336, 338-9, 345, 362, 366
Corinth 214-5, 219, 237
costum 149
Crantor 65
crow 341
Culex 337, 347, 485-6
culture, *see* nature
cultus 221, 260
Cymodoce 205

dative 251, 256, 287-8, 334
decor 91, 390, 489; *decorus* 91; *decus* 91, 130, 144, 389, 401; *see* beauty
decurrere 126
dedication, of poetry 51-4, 75; as a poet 470-1, 473
deesse, scansion 134-5; *in* 151
deinde 306
delicatus 72-3, 392
deliciae 72-3, 108, 169, 397
demittere 274, 353-4
depromere 307
description 5-6, 18 n. 55, n. 61, 91-2, 123, 190, 194-5, 201-2, 211, 221-2, 233, 247, 253, 287, 294, 339-40, 348-50, 495; *see ekphrasis*, *villa*, visual attitude
descriptiones (*'Haupttopoi'*) *morbi* 66-8, 130, 135, 338-9, 343, 382, 390, 425, 430, 452; *mortis* 66-8, 130, 135, 140-3, 155 n. 36, 338-9, 343, 369, 382, 390, 430, 436, 452; *funeris* 66-8, 108, 146, 152, 343, 357-8, 369, 382, 385, 396, 402, 425, 430, 436, 438, 452; spices in *descr. funeris* 146, 148-51, 358, 363-6, 439-40; *topoi* in *descr. funeris* 146, 148, 152, 154-5, 385, 441; *see* suicide, survivor
desidia 61
detonare 483
development of themes 74, 473, 495
diadema 266
diaeta 9, 20 n. 80, 246
Diana 284, 286, 291-2, 302-4, 306-8, 326
Dicaercheus 196, 252; Dicarcheus 195-6, 252, 260, 271
dicare 113, 448-9
didactic poetry 86, 100, 120, 324
dies 103, 181-2, 400, 456, 464, 501
dimittere 274, 353-4
Dione 456-7
Dionysus, *see* Bacchus
discolor 320
dispendium 278
dissonus 262
doctus 61, 264, 352, 372, 377, 457, 475, 487-9
dolphin 158, 232, 264, 310
Domitianus 1-2, 13 n. 9, 14 n. 15, n. 16, 15 n. 24, n. 26, 60, 67, 71, 209, 290, 342, 345, 351, 359, 368, 371-2, 376, 383, 385-6, 388, 391, 412, 415, 453, 484
Doris 257
dorsum 213
dreams 182-3, 495, 501
dulcis 83, 105, 108, 134, 204, 331, 402, 469, 471, 505
dum 465
dux 201, 342

ecce 302-3
education 118, 124-5
ekphrasis 6, 92, 190, 194, 287; *see* description
elephant 375, 380
ellipsis 60, 140, 427, 484
Elysiums, *see* Underworld
Elysius 446 n. 10, 497
eminere 246
en 84, 412
enallage 96-7, 119, 294, 296, 408
encaustic painting 166, 234
encomium 6-7, 18 n. 55, 190-2, 257-8, 265, 275-7, 327, 329, 333-4, 361, 390-2, 394, 404-5, 424-5, 451-2, 454, 466, 472-3, 475, 482, 488, 495, 503; *see laudatio*
enjambment 145, 346, 359, 417, 504
Ennius 486-7

Envy, *see* Invidia
eous 247-8
Ephyre 214-5
epicedion 57, 60, 64-7, 71, 160, 333, 356, 384, 425, 466, 495; *see consolatio*, titles
epicureanism 175, 180, 191-2, 208-10, 214, 227, 261, 267-72, 274, 276-7, 279-80, 327, 330, 452, 504-6
epigram 59, 190, 282-3, 336-8, 342, 369-70
epiphany 205, 254, 451, 501
epitaphs 65-6, 68, 76, 86, 91, 93-4, 98, 122-3, 125, 135, 143, 173-4, 179, 182, 336-7, 356, 410, 419, 425, 430, 433, 490-1, 496
epithalamium 5, 18 n. 55, 71, 290
epyllion 18 n. 52, 190, 247 n. 27
erepere 212
erotic vocabulary 95, 105, 108, 286, 301-2, 316-8, 343
errare 345; *error* 272-3
esse 194-5, 380, 425; avoided 115, 363; omitted 8, 20 n. 77, 56, 60-1, 171, 176, 198, 238, 445, 468
et, epexegetical 256; contrasting 274, 278; and *aut* 462; and *etiam* 84, 245, 323, 424; postpositive 158, 244-5, 323, 396; with repetitions 346-7
etymology 9, 20 n. 84, 151, 164, 205, 217-9, 242-3, 293, 437
eucharisticon 5, 57, 70-1
Euhan 459
Eumaeus 425
Euphrates 266-7
Euploea 243
-eus 130-1, 362, 410; Greek 472
ex 387-8
exclusus amator 286, 318, 326
exerere 477
exhaurire 439-40
eyes 95-6, 141-2, 154-5, 185, 221, 417-20, 433, 505

facilis 291, 362-3; *facilitas* 283
facultas 164, 183
facundus 9, 20 n. 81, 126, 343; *facundia* 199-200
famulus 68, 105, 391, 398-9, 402, 404-5
Fata 128-9, 135, 425-6, 449-50, 505; *see* Parcae
fateor 107
Fauns, *see* satyrs
favere 464
favere 464
favourite slave 3, 67, 72-3, 110, 394, 448-9
favourite words and expressions of St. 8-9, 78-9, 97-8, 111, 121, 132, 136, 239, 264, 329
felix 179, 201, 207, 258, 267, 276-7, 467
fenus 278
-fer 116, 159
ferire 243-4
fertur 309
ferus 136-8
fessus, 9, 20 n. 81, 83, 225
fifth day 435-6
financial vocabulary 60-2, 277-8, 455
firmare 384
Flavius Ursus 60-1, 71-2, 134, 199, 207, 390-2, 399-401, 404-5, 423, 425-6, 429-30, 437-40, 442-4, 449
flavus 299
flowers 97, 121-2
fluctivagus 118
forma 91-2, 136, 156, 338, 358, 489-90; *see* beauty
formidatus 379
forsan 9, 20 n. 81, 447-8
forsitan 20 n. 81, 447-8
fortasse 9, 20 n. 81, 446-8
fortuna 128-9, 136, 268-9, 390, 397-8, 429, 433
fragilis 141-2
frigere 140-1; *frigidus* 60
frons 87-8, 96, 276
fulmen 89, 182, 483-4, 492
fulminatus 492
functus 174-5
fundus 325
funeral speech 63-4, 452 n. 4, 466
funus 85, 119, 147, 152, 357; *see descriptiones*
Furies 136, 162-3, 500
furor 210, 383
future tense 146, 268, 335, 486, 488; participle 102, 175, 343

Galatea 205-6, 257
Gallio 466, 469
garden 285-7, 291, 311, 314
gaudere 134, 208, 228, 230, 235
gaza 266
geminus 204, 271
genae 185, 297, 505
genethliacon 5, 18 n. 52, n. 54, n. 55, 57, 61, 71, 281, 316, 450-2, 455-6, 459-60; *topoi* in 450-2, 456, 463, 494, 500
genialis 488, 505
genitalis 327, 488, 505
genitive 78, 173, 239-40, 252, 266, 280, 374, 396, 415, 435, 445-6, 481, 484, 500
Genius 451-2, 495, 501, 505
genus 92, 108, 358-9, 399-400, 405

geographical adjectives 148, 217, 219, 247-8, 266, 378, 497
germen 172, 431
gestamen 132
Geticus 232, 356, 475
gladiator 9, 20 n. 80, 370, 386
Glaucias 56, 68-70, 73, 96-8, 100-5, 108-10, 121-4, 130-2, 135, 137, 140, 148, 157, 160-2, 164-74, 182-6, 339, 352, 363, 390-2, 417, 419-20, 449, 453; vocative of 184
gradus 222, 294, 303, 377
gramen 149, 365, 440
Greek culture 1-2, 14 n. 20, 96, 125-6, 193-4, 216, 239, 252-3, 407
gressus 122, 130, 303, 377
grief 59, 65-6, 74-5, 79, 89, 143, 146-7, 151-2, 155, 160, 182, 186, 389-92, 394, 400, 402-3, 430, 438, 442-3, 445, 452, 473, 493, 505
guinea-fowl 359-61
gymnas 199

Haemonius 116, 412, 424
hair 8, 97, 141, 153, 413, 417-9
hare 337, 370-1, 376
heaven 459-6, 499
Helicon 217, 219, 355, 462-3
hendecasyllables 3, 5, 68, 267, 453, 489
hendiadys 85, 155, 393, 400, 428
Hercules 116, 124, 130-1, 197, 206-8, 213 n. 14, 216, 232, 259, 320
heu 87, 401, 467
hiatus 94, 184; metrical 178, 379
hilaris 9, 20 n. 84, 103-4, 153, 329-30
Hippokrene 218-9
Homerus 64-5, 124, 127, 168, 216, 257, 290, 311, 382, 468-70, 474
homosexuality 72-3, 413-4
honestus 331-2
honos 87, 102, 329, 331, 414, 458
Horatius 2, 128, 165, 178, 188, 191, 212, 228, 239, 265, 269, 293, 296-7, 311, 337, 402-3, 446, 464, 470, 472-3
Hyantius 459-60
hymn 342, 357, 456, 458, 495
hyperbaton 56, 106, 396, 408, 412
hyperbole 60, 77, 79, 101, 211, 213, 219, 229, 270, 348, 358, 462-3, 469-70, 474

Ianus 295-6
-icus 298
igni 177
illius 88, 412
illusion 189
immensus 179
imminere 302
imperial cult 2-3, 15 n. 26, 18 n. 63, 60, 167, 492, 496, 502
imperfect tense 126-7, 137, 292, 428
improbus 76, 294
improvisation 4, 16 n. 42, 17 n. 43, n. 45, n. 47, 58, 100, 238, 265, 283, 372
imputare 61-2, 468
Inarime 241-2
incendere 134
incense 150, 439, 463
inconsistency of St. 101, 171, 214, 357, 470, 493, 503-4
incubare 322-3, 504; *incumbere* 322; *incubus* 322-3
incurvare 287-8
indicative 60, 128
indoles 92, 358
indulgere 219-20
inferre 103
infinitive historic 130; following adjectives 153; comis 153; *cura* 238; *facilis* 363; *gaudere* 134; *hilaris* 153; *ingemere* 386; *memento* 318; *negare* 225; *optimus* 332; *paratum* 270; *prohibere* 185; *tumere* 381; *valere* 220-1
ingemere 386
ingens 328
inire 178, 345
innumerus 179
Ino 116, 119, 138, 157-8, 215
inscriptions, *see* epitaphs
Invidia 112, 127-9, 135, 380, 390, 426, 429-30, 433, 471
invidia deorum 57, 128-9, 313, 343, 380, 395, 425-6, 429-30, 467, 490-1
invocation 290, 452, 456, 458, 462, 495, 501
ipse 170, 403
ira 370, 372-4, 381
ire 9, 20 n. 80, 115, 120, 178-9; perfect tense contracted 144-5, 178; in *-v-* 144-5
iste 138, 183, 260, 464
Isthmiacus 237
iubere 415
iugum 230-1, 303, 475
iunctus 121, 399-400

Juvenalis 1, 15 n. 23, 414
juxtaposition of small/great, one/many, past/present, land/water *etc.* 85, 98, 130, 148, 155, 204, 207, 209, 216, 222-3, 228, 239, 241, 249, 253, 288, 346, 349, 358, 360, 365, 369-70, 374, 381, 385, 388, 397, 399, 407, 416-7, 499; *see* nature

Lacedaemonium 249
lacerna 133
lacessere 168
Lachesis 127-9; *see* Parcae
lacteus 91, 100
laena 133
laevus 308-9
lamentatio 66-8, 90, 339, 341-2, 348, 357-8, 369, 372, 280-1, 391, 405, 412, 425, 430, 442, 452, 467
lamenting 63-8, 74, 103-4, 108, 135, 352, 380, 390, 401, 425, 437-8, 442, 454, 473, 490; *see lamentatio*
Laodamia 501-3
lassus 9, 20 n. 81, 83, 210-1
latebrosus 317
latrare 82
laudatio 18 n. 55, 66-8, 90-2, 116, 130, 134, 338-9, 342, 357-8, 369, 372, 382, 390, 399, 404-5, 412, 421, 424-5, 452, 466
laudatio funebris 18 n. 59, 64, 130, 466
Ledaeus 420
Lerna 159
Lethe 168, 447, 494
levare 136, 443
levis 59, 283, 302, 362, 494
lexical variation 8-9, 76-7, 103, 115, 132-3, 137, 146, 174, 206-7, 209-10, 226, 232, 277, 287, 289, 292, 323, 343, 350, 353, 380, 394, 439-40
libellus 18 n. 49, 59
Libya 378, 387-8
licet 9, 20 n. 81, 445
lima 59, 457; *limatus* 236
limen vitae 93, 431-2
limes 156, 246
Limon 193, 244-5, 260
lion 3, 79, 368, 370-86, 388-90; taming of 368-72, 374-6; hunting of 378-9; human qualities of 370, 380, 382-6
liquor 151
Locri 426-7
locus amoenus 285-6, 289, 311, 314
longaevus 474
love elegy 5, 286
lubricus 78, 180, 442
Lucanus 61-2, 208, 210, 243, 277, 324, 327, 352, 450-6, 460, 462-75, 485, 493-5, 499-506; life of 477, 479-80, 486; *Silvae* of 5, 62, 453, 482, 486; *Bellum Civile* 452, 466, 473, 477, 481-3, 485-6, 493-9; allusions to *Bellum Civile* in II.7 470, 477, 483-5, 492-3, 498-9; other works of 473-82, 493
Lucifer 412-3, 435-6
Lucretius 175-6, 179, 210, 227, 269-70, 309, 324, 373, 486-7, 505
ludere 475, 478; *lusus* 53, 478
lustrum 197-8, 432
Lyaeus 215, 254; *see* Bacchus

mactus 252
Maeonius 127
magis 169
magpie 341, 352, 354, 362
mannerism 7-8, 19 n. 65, n. 67, 233, 489
manus 128-9, 135-6, 170-1, 294, 314-5, 396-7, 426, 435
marble 188-9, 216, 241, 246-51
margo 97, 431
maria 263-4
Martialis 2, 51-3, 59, 68-9, 109-10, 130, 166, 188, 197, 249, 254, 265, 282, 341, 369-70, 375-6, 387, 394, 420, 432, 451, 453-5, 467, 486, 489, 504
Massylus 378
medius 330-1, 345-6, 383
Megalia 243
Meleager 337
Meles 470-1
memento 318
memor 354
Menander comicus 124-5
Menander rhetor 64-5, 91-2, 128, 173, 342, 413, 450, 472
Mercurius 165-6, 458
merx 9, 20 n. 80, 111
-met 78
metamorphosis 284-5, 322
metaphor, *see* comparisons
metonymy, antonomy, synecdoche 56, 81, 84, 111, 118, 124, 127, 133, 138, 151, 154, 159, 166, 177, 186, 220, 222, 224, 236, 241, 243, 257, 260, 266, 292, 326, 347, 377, 424, 427, 441, 447, 457, 468, 479, 485
metre and prosody 3, 5, 18 n. 54, 20 n. 83, 62, 67, 123, 134-5, 151, 177, 184, 245, 261-2, 267, 301, 330, 338, 453, 460-1, 466, 468; *see* hendecasyllables
military vocabulary 190-1, 196, 227-8, 230, 239-40, 259, 268, 382-4
Minerva 195, 262-3
mirror 8, 285
Misenum 193, 242
mitis 9, 20 n. 84, 132, 313
mixtus 98, 131
modestus 211
modo ... nunc 134, 154, 362
moenia 252, 411-2
monosyllables 94, 151, 237, 330, 380, 425

monstrare 363, 373-4, 377, 449
moods, see imperative, indicative, infinitive, subjunctive
mores 390, 399-400, 404-5, 420-1, 449
morsus 376-7
Mortes 129, 504
multum 407
Mulvius 156
murmur 106, 121, 343-4, 471
Muses 125-7, 163, 216-9, 261, 290, 452, 458-62, 465-6, 470-1, 473; *see* Calliope, Thalia
Mygdonius 258-9
myrrh 149, 365, 439
mythology 7, 9, 18 n. 55, n. 63, 19 n. 71, 116, 118, 137, 162-3, 190, 192, 201, 205, 253-4, 282, 284-6, 291-2, 295, 405, 407, 430, 472-3, 508; closure-function of 211, 216, 220, 223, 228, 245, 253-4, 257, 321, 348, 369, 403; *Mythologemtriade* 162

Naiad 284, 290-1, 306-8, 326; of the Underworld 446-7; *see* nymph
nam 421-2
names at the end of poems 75, 102-3, 152, 183-4, 276, 327, 335, 361, 372, 389, 437, 450
Naples 1-2, 14 n. 20, 53, 192-3, 197, 200, 239, 241, 243, 251-3, 271-2, 407, 453; bay of 193, 195, 199, 260
Nasamonius 491
Natura 90, 113, 129, 352-3
nature 210, 263, 285-6, 311, 373, 377, 462; and culture 3, 8, 19 n. 72, 189-91, 203-5, 221, 223, 285-6, 353, 368, 370, 453; and art 16 n. 42, 188, 223, 228, 239, 251; subjected by man 3, 188, 190-1, 211-2, 214, 216, 224, 227-31, 240, 258-9, 263, 370, 372, 374-6; personified 226-7, 230; filled with joy 208, 230
nec 229, 307, 405; postpositive 20 n. 82, 442
nectere 432
nefas 155, 380, 395, 493
Nemea 159; scansion 184
Nemesis 129, 390, 429-30, 433-5, 471
neologisms and innovations 8, 20 n. 78, 79, 118, 120, 123, 159, 196, 199, 211-2, 215, 232, 236, 252, 264-7, 275-6, 278, 288, 298, 347-8, 362, 386, 402, 433, 437-8, 451, 459, 486, 488, 492
neque 307
Nereid, *see* nymph
Nereus 240-1
Nero 15 n. 24, 479-82, 488, 494, 500-1
Nesis 242
Nestor 98, 258-9
nexus 106, 434-5
nightingale 341, 344, 352, 355-6
nigrare 437-8
nitere 91, 289, 495; *nitidus* 91, 200, 289, 488; *nitor* 289, 433, 488
niveus 299-300, 310, 316
noli 9, 20 n. 80, 470
Nomas 250
non 132, 267, 377-8, 422
non ... si 216, 422
noverca 98-9
nudus 257, 309
nurus 276, 406-7
nymph 204-6, 253-7, 282-7, 290-5, 298-9, 301-2, 304, 307-11, 313, 316-9, 321, 326; Underworld 446-7

ob 9, 20 n. 81, 434
obire 175
obitus 492
obliquus 212, 322, 448
Oebalius 124, 408
oestrus 457
Olympic Games 420, 431
onyx 441
Opheltes 157-60
opobalsamum 150
optimus 207, 332
opusculum 15 n. 28, 55
orare 114
Orpheus 81, 232, 471-2, 474-5, 479-80, 493, 495
ortus 92, 108, 112, 225, 492
Ovidius 118, 132, 138-9, 175, 182, 200, 202, 205, 213, 215, 222, 224, 234, 249, 251, 254, 283-6, 294-9, 301-2, 309, 313, 315, 317, 336-43, 352-6, 358-60, 363, 366-7, 406, 429-30, 434, 446-7, 454, 458, 481, 486-8, 502
oxymoron 105, 129, 143, 186, 225, 259, 331, 351, 416, 419

paenitet 331
Palaemon 138, 157-8, 215
Palladius 315
pallere 172, 178; *pallidus* 500
pallium 125-6
Pan 282-6, 289, 291-5, 299, 301-2, 304, 306-13, 316, 319-21, 323
Panes 254-7
Papinius, father of St. 1, 9, 13 n. 3, n. 6, n. 10, n. 12, 15 n. 30, 89, 124, 197-8, 407, 409, 427, 470, 481, 498

paradox 8, 68, 83, 88, 103, 113, 143, 284, 370, 379, 391, 402, 504
Parcae 128-9, 135-6, 140, 163, 334, 471-2, 490
parents 69, 76, 89, 108-9, 113, 155, 390, 437, 446; and foster-parents 68, 80, 86, 89-90, 99, 108-9, 113-21, 146, 157, 168, 170, 393
Paris 407-9, 493
parody 336-9, 344, 359, 368-9
parrot 69, 142, 148, 336, 338-43, 345, 347, 352, 353 n. 18, 357-9, 361-3, 365-6, 375, 380, 385
Parthenius 66
Parthenope 195, 218
Parthenopaeus 97, 315, 413-4, 416-8, 432
partridge 352, 355
parvus 290, 327-8
patria 359, 454, 466-7
Patroclus 424
patronage 2, 4, 14 n. 21, 15 n. 23
peacock 359-61
Pegasus 218-220, 457
Pelusiacus 485
penes 11, 20 n. 82, n. 84, 298, 458
per 330-1, 415
perfect tense 164, 292, 303, 361, 404; infinitive 113
periphrase 141, 165, 232, 339, 358-60
personification 19 n. 72, 114, 129, 156, 177-8, 205, 209, 226-7, 243, 269, 313, 315-6, 429, 505
pes 465
Phaetontius 347-8
Pharius 111, 440
pheasant 359-61
Phemonoe 218, 220
Phidias 235-6
Philetus 134, 145, 148, 208, 390-2, 397-407, 409-10, 412-4, 417, 419-21, 423-4, 430, 432, 435, 437, 439, 442-4, 446-9
Phlegethon 164
Phoebeius 326
Phoebus 217-20, 225, 352, 409, 411-2, 457-61
phoenix 150, 358, 364-7, 440
Pholoe 293-5, 297-8, 309-10
Phosphorus 129, 435-6
Phrygius 140; Phryx 140, 476
physiognomists 96
Pierius 218, 261; Pieros 354
pignus 115, 316; *pignera* 395
Pindarus 65, 470
pinus 292, 314, 320-1, 409
Piplea 217-9
Pisa 236
placare 260
placidus 153, 199, 201-3, 210, 274, 299, 381
plaga 78, 396-7
platanus 311, 313-4
plebs 273
plectrum 272-3, 494
pleonasm 178, 280, 388, 400, 403
Plinius minor 54, 56-7, 187-91, 212, 228, 282, 286, 394
pluperfect tense 126-7, 137, 346, 428
plural, poetic 77, 82, 84-5, 88, 90, 99-100, 103, 105, 107, 112, 117, 139, 145, 158, 162, 164, 166, 170, 174, 176, 186, 195, 197, 207, 211, 225, 237, 263-4, 289, 301, 313, 327, 344, 350, 440-1, 444; other 214, 404, 499
Poggio 10-1, 21 n. 96, n. 97, n. 99, n. 101
pointe 118, 221, 282, 286, 351, 369, 393; *see schlussbildende Pointe*
political vocabulary 267, 271-2
Poliziano 10-1, 21 n. 94, n. 96, n. 98, n. 99
Polla Argentaria 61-2, 451, 454-5, 473, 477-8, 482-3, 488, 495, 502-4; identified with Polla Pollii 193 n. 7, 276-7, 454-5, 504-5; identified with Sts.' wife 454
Polla, wife of Pollius 192-3, 197, 199-201, 238, 257-8, 260, 275-80, 329, 454-5, 504-5
Pollius Felix 53, 59, 72, 187-93, 196-200, 207-11, 213, 216-7, 219-20, 227-35, 240-1, 245, 251-3, 257-75, 277, 279-80, 327, 329, 331, 454-5
Polyclitus 234-6
Pompeius 407, 484-5, 491-2, 494, 498-9
ponere 99, 162, 263
pōpulus 320
portico 191, 206, 211-5
portraits, of the dead 166-7, 186, 502-4; other 233-6
post 119, 198, 415-6
Pozzuoli 14 n. 18, 192, 195-6, 252-3, 271-2
praise, *see encomium, laudatio*
precari 448
precocity 93-4, 121, 123, 130, 198, 423, 471, 478, 482, 485-6
premere 317
present tense 77, 165, 265, 268, 292, 303, 380, 404
Priamus 258-9, 266
primaevus 395
prius ... nunc 211, 213, 299, 341-2, 346, 351
probitas 73, 94
Prochyta 242

Procne 137, 355-6
procul 9, 20 n. 86, 246, 397, 412
prodesse 375
prodigus 147
prolusio 4, 17 n. 44, 236, 478, *see Silvae*
propempticon 5, 18 n. 55, 71, 392
Propertius 19 n. 71, 75, 103, 219, 229, 295, 442, 465
prose prefaces 51-4, 70, 265
Proserpina 141, 447-8
prosilire 106
Protesilaos 501-2
protestations of truth 100, 111-2, 409, 421-2; with *vidi* 86, 120, 405, 409
psittacus 342, 359; *see* parrot
pudicus 279, 306; *pudor* 72, 94, 105, 306, 310, 382-3, 417, 421-2
puer 68, 391
puer/senex-topos 93-4, 333, 423
puns 55, 62 n. 6, 151, 164, 201, 205, 207-8, 254, 277, 293, 332, 334, 437, 444, 449, 455
purpureus 91, 94-5, 134, 247, 249, 460-1, 475
Pylades 424

qualis 415-9, 490
quamquam 8, 20 n. 82, 139
quamvis 8, 20 n. 81, 445
quantity, words for (fusing with words for size) 179, 328
-que explicative 203, 374, 403, 489; adversative 278, 416; postpositive 325
-que ... -que 156, 175, 180, 234, 268, 351, 386-7, 422, 449
querulus 350-1, 361-2
questions 75-6, 90, 312, 342-3, 372, 392, 425, 443, 490
qui (ni)si 8, 20 n. 82, 405
quies 198, 209-10, 330
quin 174, 297
Quinquatrua Minervae, see Alban Games
Quintilianus 467, 474, 487
quis, dative plur. 8, 20 n. 82, 352
quod 147-8, 375; postpositive 249, 442

radere 235-6
radiatus 95
rapere 76, 93, 112, 174, 444
rapidus 210, 263, 496
raven 341, 352-3, 362
recitation 4, 15 n. 23, 17 n. 48, 53
recludere 363
recolere 319
recusatio 475
redux 476
regina 200-1, 454
regnator 201, 359
repetition of words 8, 77, 83, 93, 98, 103, 132, 146, 222, 237-8, 252, 267, 277, 312, 318, 377-8, 396-7, 440, 446-7, 457, 464; *see* anaphora; of sounds 14 n. 22, 99-100, 287, 293, 428; *see* rhyme
res gestae 130, 381
reserare 217
respirare 365
retirement from politics 2, 15 n. 23, 209-10, 267, 270-1
rec 200
rhetoric 5-6, 18 n. 58, n. 60, 63-5, 91-2, 148, 190, 235, 247, 259, 290, 400, 405, 407, 451, 466, 472, 488, 496
rhetorical formulas 5, 9, 86, 100, 108, 116, 118, 146, 155, 176-7, 192, 234, 239, 253; questions 74, 118, 136, 312
rhyme 105, 108, 116, 238, 272, 436
ripa 299-300
roses 122, 127
roseus 91, 94, 122, 127
rotator 459
rubens 91, 133
ruber 94
rudis 312-3
rutilus 349-50

saevus 59, 139, 176, 207, 392-3, 397-8, 403, 436-7, 491-2
saffron 148-9, 365, 440
satyr 253-7, 283, 286, 292, 299, 323; *see* Panes
schetliasmos 392, 409, 476
schlussbildende Pointe 115, 146, 211, 221, 257, 321, 363, 369, 403-4, 439
Schwebesituation 7-8, 116, 142-3, 205, 223-4, 284-5, 289, 323, 344, 349, 383-4, 412-4
sed 399; postpositive 20 n. 82, 112, 367, 442
Seneca pater 52, 228, 454-5
Seneca filius 52, 54, 57, 61-2, 189, 191, 193, 209-10, 277, 324, 393-4, 414, 443, 454, 458, 466, 469, 481
sensus 126, 152, 397
series 168
servire 99, 227, 240-1
seventh day 135, 140, 338, 436
shadow 223-5, 288-9, 323; *see umbra*
ship 210, 274-5, 408-9
sic 309-10, 383-4
si quid 235
Sidonius 52, 70-1, 151, 187, 247, 249, 276, 440, 454, 462, 470, 475-6, 485, 489-90
Silius Italicus 193, 378, 404, 447, 451

Silvae chronology 3, 15 n. 28, 53, 71, 116-7; structure of Bk. II 3-4, 17 n. 47, 453; as a title 4, 16 n. 41, n. 42; *genres* in 4-6, 63-8, 187-92, 281-6, 336-41, 368-9, 450-3; way of publishing 4, 17 n. 48, 18 n. 49, 53, 62; unedited poems 3, 16 n. 31, 52, 89; ms. tradition 10-1, 20 n. 93, 21 nn. 94-101; (modernistic) character 4-9, 127-8, 188-92, 227-8, 324; and Sts.' epics (language and style) 8-9, 20n. 78, n. 83, 58, 78, 83-4, 179, 238, 263-5, 283, 289-90, 297-8, 304-6, 312, 316, 319-20, 326, 344, 352, 359, 377, 383, 417-9, 445, 447-8, 507-8; structural devices in poems 75-7, 83, 189, 201-2, 327, 340, 357-8, 473; (terms of) literary criticism in 4-5, 17 n. 47, 51, 57-9, 216-7, 221, 264, 280, 283, 316, 327-9, 334, 457, 462-3, 469-70, 482-3, 486-8, 498; *see* improvisation, lexical variation, Lucanus, *prolusio*, repetition, Statius, titles
singular 404
Sirens 80-1, 195, 262-3
Sirius 129, 177
situs 107, 334
slaves 8, 68-9, 72, 105, 108-11, 391-5, 397-9, 404-5; slave/free 68, 97, 99, 108-10, 112, 392, 397-8, 400, 402-5, 439; slave/master 68, 104-5, 390-1, 393-4, 402-3, 423-5
snakes 98-9, 136, 159-60, 163, 379
sophists 63-4, 75
sopor 308-9
soteria 5, 18 n. 55, 57, 71
spargere 255-6
speeches in poetry 281, 286, 302, 304-5, 430, 454, 466, 470, 472-3, 507-8
spes 101, 268, 330
spices, *see descriptions*
splendour 6, 91-2, 95-6, 189, 200, 223-6, 247, 348, 358, 360, 404, 413, 417, 420, 433; *see* colour, visual attitude
stare 82, 194-5, 287, 380
starling 341, 352-4
Statius life 1-2, 13 n. 1-14 n. 20, 109-10, 197-8; *see* Claudia, Papinius; friends and patrons 2-3, 14 n. 21, 15 n. 23, 51-5, 62; erudition 8, 138, 409, 411
stemma 399-400
Stoicism 74-5, 83, 209-10, 237, 277, 330, 452, 484
stupere 127-8, 209, 320
sub auras 325
subire 144-5, 163, 298, 446, 493
subject named instead of poem 56, 127, 477-9
subjunctive 104, 126-8, 146, 312
sublimis 433
storm, symbolic 210-1, 263, 274
strangulare 9, 20 n. 80, 277
stridor 307-8, 467
structural devices, *see Silvae*
suicide 86, 146, 154, 176, 391, 438
summus 152, 168-9
superare 251
superbus 122, 272-3, 500
supine 314, 418
supra 267
Surrentum 81, 187, 193, 195-6, 259
survivor 63, 67, 129, 140, 142-3, 146, 154, 160, 174, 182-3, 380, 390, 392, 439, 441, 443, 445, 502
suus 238, 423
swan 347-8
Syene 248
syncope 172, 269
Synnas 248
syntactic reversal 243-4

tamquam 9, 20 n. 80, 293, 298
Tartaron 499
temperies 278, 327, 420
tempus erat 271
tenses of verb, *see* future tense, imperfect tense, perfect tense, present tense
tergere 167
tersus 55, 167
tesca 297
testudo 204, 349
Thalia 126-7; *see* Muses
Thebaid 1, 3, 13 n. 3, 14 n. 16, 15 n. 27, n. 30, 52, 157-8, 210, 453; *see Silvae*
Therapnaeus 123, 260
Theseus 407-8
Thespiacus 463-4
Tiber 155-6, 287, 295-6, 299, 426, 428, 475
Tirynthius 259
Tithonus 258-9
titles of the poems 69-72, 391-2
toga 101-2, 125, 133-4, 477
topoi 5-7, 12, 53, 65-6, 74-5, 89, 93, 97, 107, 122, 128, 130, 141-3, 155, 165-6, 216, 221, 228, 236, 258, 265, 269, 272, 281, 286, 290, 298, 308, 311, 313, 318, 328, 333, 349, 352, 359, 366, 380, 412-3, 430, 435-6, 462-3, 466, 471, 474-6, 491, 496-7, 501
-tor 459
torvus 137-8, 154, 413, 416-7, 433
totus 310
trees 131, 281, 283-9, 302, 311-23, 325-6, 370

trieteris 432-3
Tritonia 262-3; Tritonis 468
Troilus 409-12
tum 9, 20 n. 82, 319
tumere 104, 381; *tumidus* 207
tunc 9, 20 n. 82, 319
turbo 110-1, 269
tutari 283, 320

uber 322
Überbietung 77, 80, 124, 137, 139, 233, 358
Ulixes 137, 139-40, 425, 476
umbra 225, 285, 320; *see* shadow
Underworld 447-9, 485, 493-4; entrance into 66 n. 9, 68, 145, 157, 160-2, 165-7, 185, 338-9, 390, 442-3, 446, 495, 497-500; sterility of 163-4, 171-2, 346, 437, 498; animals in 338-9, 347, 366-7
ungula 220, 457
unus 203, 232-3, 237, 388
urere 196

valere 220-1
variation in syntax, argument, theme 68, 75, 77, 81, 116, 137, 158, 191, 228, 232, 234, 267, 329, 372, 387, 391-4, 404, 408, 410, 420, 426, 440, 490; *see* inconsistency, lexical variation, repetition
Varro Atacinus 486-7
venatio 370-2
verecundia 105; *verecundus* 73, 94, 135
Vergilius 141, 144-5, 164, 168, 201-3, 205, 213, 216, 242-5, 249, 252, 271, 295-8, 206-10, 216, 355-6, 378, 380, 383, 404, 406, 411, 414, 434, 442, 449, 468, 470, 474, 485-6, 491, 497-8, 505, 507-8
verna 68, 72, 109-10, 391
vertex 314-5
Vesuvius, eruption of 1, 261, 426-7
vicis 239-40, 491
villa 240; description of 187-92, 209, 221; on frescoes 191, 202, 207, 212; (and surroundings) symbolic for owner 190-2, 194, 196, 201, 203, 206, 208-11, 216, 221-2, 230, 239, 253, 257-8
vincire 121, 465-6
visual attitude of St. 6, 119, 134, 146, 153, 157, 200, 221-4, 226, 233, 240, 247, 339, 344, 348, 383, 408, 411
vitalia 430
vitreus 225-6, 288
vitta 87, 460-1
vivus 134, 300, 316
vocative 271, 342, 344, 385, 458, 501
volenti 9, 20 n. 80, 402
voluptas 83, 213-4, 276, 343
vulnus 57, 77-8, 444

water 7-8, 203-5, 223-4, 226, 284-9, 310-2, 315-8; symbolic for inspiration 217, 219-20, 261, 456-7, 462, 464

zeugma 7, 271, 315, 402